



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

231 .P143

C.1

Pain and gladness : a

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 046 783 655

231
P143



Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s New List.

NEW BOOK BY DR. DU BOSE.

The Reason of Life. By WILLIAM PORCHER DU BOSE, Author of "The Gospel in the Gospels," &c. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

This is an attempt to present the Christian creed, as a whole, as the completely adequate expression of the meaning and value of life.

Archbishops' Committee on Church Finance. Report with Recommendations, and Appendices. 8vo, 1s. net.

Facts and Figures on Church Finance : a Supplementary Volume to the above. From the material collected by the Committee in the course of their Inquiry, and in the preparation of their Report. Fcap. folio, 3s. 6d. net.

Leo XIII. and Anglican Orders. By Viscount HALIFAX. 8vo.

The Catholic Faith : a Manual of Instruction for Members of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, Wycliffe College, Toronto. New Impression. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 1s. net ; cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Counsel and Comfort : Letters of Maria, Mrs. Burrows. Edited by the Honble. Mrs. OLDFIELD. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

Strength from Quietness : Suggestions for Keeping a Quiet Day, chiefly addressed to Invalids and those unable to join in a Retreat. Including Addresses by Bishop KING and Dean BUTLER. By M. GILES.

Some Thoughts on God, and His Methods of Manifestation in Nature and Revelation. By Rev. J. GURNHILL, B.A., Vicar of East Stockwith. Crown 8vo, 4s. net.

The Ministry of our Lord. By the Right Rev. T. W. DRURY, D.D., Bishop of Sodor and Man. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

Central Churchmanship : or the Position, Principles and Policy of Evangelical Churchmen in relation to Modern Thought and Work. By the Rev. Canon DENTON THOMPSON, M.A., Rector of Birmingham, Rural Dean of Birmingham (Central). Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

The Master Builders : being the Story of the Acts of the Apostles retold to Children. By S. B. MACY, Author of "In the Beginning," etc. With 22 Full-page Engravings and 8 Illustrations in Black and White by T. H. ROBINSON. 4to, 3s. 6d. net.

ANGLICAN CHURCH HANDBOOKS:

Edited by the Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, Wycliffe College, Toronto.

Christian Ethics and Modern Thought. By the Right Rev. C. F. D'ARCY, D.D., Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore. 1s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s New List.

Sermons and Addresses. By EDWARD KING, D.D., late Bishop of Lincoln.
Edited by B. W. RANDOLPH, D.D., Canon of Ely. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

The Religious Question in Public Education : A Critical Examination of Schemes representing various points of View. By ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A., MICHAEL E. SADLER, C.B., M.A., Professor of the History of Education at Owens College, and CYRIL JACKSON, M.A., Vice-Chairman of the London County Council. Crown 8vo, 6s. net.

Pain and Gladness : a Biblical Study. By a SISTER in an English Community.
With a Preface by the Rev. JOHN NEVILLE FIGGIS, Litt.D. Crown 8vo.

Confession in the Church of England since the Reformation : a Paper read at Cambridge, Lent, 1911. By B. W. RANDOLPH, D.D., Canon of Ely. Crown 8vo, 1s. net.

Creed and the Creeds : Their Function in Religion. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1911. By JOHN HUNTLEY SKRINE, Vicar of St. Peter's in the East, Oxford. 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

The Resurrection and Modern Thought. By the Rev. W. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford. 8vo, 15s. net.

Life and Work of the Rev. T. T. Carter, Hon. Canon of Christchurch, Oxford, and Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer. By J. F. M. CARTER. Based on "The Life and Letters of Thomas Thellusson Carter," by Archdeacon Hutchings. With 5 Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

God in Evolution : A Pragmatic Study of Theology. By FRANCIS HOWE JOHNSON. Crown 8vo.

Ideals of Holiness : an Aid to Preparation for Holy Communion. By the Rev. F. W. DRAKE, Priest-in-Charge of St. John's Church, Wilton Road, S.W. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

The Holy Eucharist : A Series of Lectures. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. net.

Father Pollock and His Brother, Mission Priests of St. Alban's, Birmingham. With a Prefatory Letter by the Lord Bishop of BIRMINGHAM. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

The Use of the Bible in the Education of the Young : A Book for Parents and Teachers. By T. RAYMONT, M.A. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Chosen and Sent Forth : Notes of a Retreat for Priests. By the Rev. JOHN WAKEFORD, B.D., Prebendary of Clifton in Lincoln Minster. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. net.

Studies in the Resurrection of Christ. An Argument. By the Rev. CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ripon and Editorial Secretary of the S.P.G. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d. net. Popular Edition, Crown 8vo, gilt top, paper covers, 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

PAIN AND GLADNESS

PAIN AND GLADNESS

A BIBLICAL STUDY

BY

A SISTER IN AN ENGLISH COMMUNITY

WITH A PREFACE BY

THE REV. J. NEVILLE FIGGIS, LITT.D., C.R.

“No Nay, No Yea”

STANDARD LIBRARY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1911

All rights reserved

40

165776

1811 00787

THIS BOOK
IS DEDICATED
BY MRS. SIDGWICK'S GENEROUS PERMISSION
TO THE MEMORY OF
PROFESSOR HENRY SIDGWICK
WHO TAUGHT US
TO SEEK TRUTH FAITHFULLY

PREFACE

THIS little book is its own best commendation. The work of one with unrivalled knowledge alike of the philosophic problem and the Biblical treatment, it is withal written with such lucid simplicity that it may be read with ease by any. Yet it leaves untouched no aspect of this profound and fundamental difficulty. For profound and fundamental the difficulty is. To many in our modern world it is perhaps the supreme difficulty of all—the hindrance *par excellence* to their acceptance of the Christian view of life. Its existence makes patent the futility of nearly all the schemes for what has been called a “reduced Christianity”; for all such schemes leave this initial problem unresolved. There are those, like Harnack in “Das Wesen des Christenthums,” who seek to accommodate Christianity to the modern mind by reducing the Gospel to the declaration of God’s Fatherhood. In this they think to discern the prospect of a universally acceptable religion, purged of all “magical and miraculous elements.” But, as a matter of fact, it is precisely this doctrine which the modern mind finds hardest of belief. In the face of actual observed facts there is no miracle so improbable, no dogma so strange, as the saying “that the hairs of your head are all numbered,” or the command to “cast all your care upon Him, for He careth for you.” The problem of

suffering is, of course, as old as humanity. But it has been rendered more acute to us through diverse causes. Partly, we have a wider knowledge of the remorseless carnage of Nature. She appears quite non-moral; and the course both of natural and human development may seem to favour the view of Nietzsche, that all we can discern in the universe is a blind and cruel "will to power" striving through everything; or else to promote a despairing agnosticism for which life is but "the dream of an impossible God." Partly, also, the development of material civilisation has made comfort the natural environment of many lives, causing them to revolt against the very idea of suffering. Now, this difficulty cannot be thrust into a corner. It must be squarely faced, if the Christian doctrine of God as Love is to remain our faith. The merit of this book is that it finds in the very fact of suffering the evidence of that Love, and the inner secret of the universe. Thus the difficulty is transmuted into a support; and the meaning of our trouble is seen as the source of our triumph. The true method of apologetic will always be found to be this: not to deny or minimise the difficulty, but to examine it, to learn its true import, and to seek therein the very attraction of the Christian message. This is true of miracle; it is true of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation; it is true of the nature of an historical religion; and of the problem of sin and forgiveness; and it is true, above all, as our author shows, of the age-long perplexity of suffering. It can only be met by an appeal to the Cross—which is the

revelation of the "sacred heart" of reality, and the philosophy of all life.

"Is my gloom, after all,
Shade of His hand outstretched caressingly?"

It is the distinctive merit of the Christian Faith, that it is a philosophy not merely of suffering, for that is true of Oriental pessimism, but of suffering as the revelation of love and the meaning of life. Others would tell us that pain is a mere appearance, like individuality, and has no part in the true reality, the abstract being. But this is false to all the facts. The harmony of the universe is achieved at the cost of all that is most living in our experience, personality. Or again, if pain be a mere delusion to be transcended by effort, how does that help us? It may indeed aid men to overcome minor trouble, or to bear pain with courage. But it helps no whit to a real solution. The delusion of suffering is itself suffering; while the spectacle of gods, *ῥεῖα ζῶοντες*, but serves to make more bitter the anguish of men who are not gods; the "lamentation and the ancient tale of wrong" is all the worse, is all the deeper, for those who dream of others

"Who lie beside their nectar, and the bolts are hurled
Far below them in the valleys, and the clouds are
lightly curled
Round their golden houses, girdled with the gleaming
world."

Christian Science may have its use in its emphasis in the power of spirit over matter in an age when too many have been enslaved by a mechanical theory of existence. But to deny that pain is a real part of experience can offer no

enduring comfort to the multitudes of sorrowing men. The Risen Christ is the only true solace to the bereaved; the Cross is the sole lasting hope to the suffering. Our author shows us how suffering is in some way an element in the life of God; and exhibits it as the only method of spiritual advance; while she discerns in sacrifice the true form of gladness, for beings whose nature can only find itself in Love. Thus she rejects emphatically the shallow view of Job's comforters, that all pain is mere penalty; that we should not suffer if we did not sin; while she also repudiates that facile optimism which declares that pain for men is always contrary to the will of God. She shows how suffering is necessarily incident to the life of a developing spiritual being; and cannot be done away in any education, because "Man partly is and wholly hopes to be," and there must always be a gulf between the actual and the desired. Further, she goes on to show how, as an actual fact, pain may be seen to be part of the very material of gladness; how, from childhood onwards, men are taught that they must lose their life to find it. Thus she vindicates in the most striking way the Christian doctrine of God, and finds in the Cross the only satisfactory philosophy of pain. May it be that this book will be to some who read it the means whereby they hear for themselves and obey that call from Him who is the heart of God, "to take up their Cross and deny themselves and follow Christ."

J. NEVILLE FIGGIS, C.R.

HOUSE OF THE RESURRECTION,
MIRFIELD,

October 14, 1911.

PREFATORY NOTE

OF the theology in this Essay I am far from confident. It is only too likely that in matters so high and difficult I may have said what is mistaken or misleading, or lacking in reverence. But it is, of course, in the fullest sense written under correction. The needs of the time seem to call for speaking on subjects on which one would rather keep silence. And if hazardous speculations are justifiable at all in defence of the Faith, it is perhaps better that the risk should be taken, not by our spiritual fathers and leaders, but by those whose words will carry no weight, and by whose failures no one will be scandalized.

Those who know how close are the ties in Community life will readily understand that a writing of this kind cannot be done at all without the co-operation of the Community : and in the present case, the Community counts for at least as much as the writer.

Our thanks are due to Principal G. A. Smith, for permission to quote at length from his "Isaiah" ; and to Dr. Mason, for the use of his notes on the Atonement : to Father Figgis, for much valuable help besides his Preface ; and to another distinguished theologian, who has most kindly read the proof-sheets.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. PAIN IN POPULAR ESTIMATION	I
II. PSYCHOLOGY	5
III. MORALS	16
IV. THE OLD TESTAMENT	20
V. THE NEW TESTAMENT	49
VI. THE UNITY OF GOD	62
VII. THE ETERNAL IN THE TEMPORAL	73
VIII. CONCLUSION	92
IX. PRACTICAL RESULTS	94
APPENDIX	103

I

PAIN IN POPULAR ESTIMATION

PAIN¹ is out of fashion, both in practice and theory, as it never has been in modern times.

In practice, perhaps, this cannot altogether be helped. It is certain that, as regards physical pain, we cannot bear that sort of suffering as our ancestors used to bear it. Yet even here, it is not only a matter of more sensitive nerves. Our not very remote ancestors bore physical pain better than we do chiefly because they had no theoretical or reflective aversion to pain as such, nor to the infliction of it : and so they took it all in good part if, by the chance of war or politics or polemics, they found themselves thrust into vile dungeons and maimed and tortured and burnt at the stake. So also in practice they held it cheap. To have got what they wanted at the cost of so much suffering only enhanced the triumph and enjoyment of fruition.

With us, it is just the other way. Painless pleasures are what we want. And it is chiefly

¹ By pain I mean not only nor chiefly physical suffering, but Feeling which is in itself disagreeable, of every sort, however originated, and of every degree from the most trifling inconvenience upwards.

because of our mental repugnance to it that we bear physical pain badly. It sickens us even to think of; and we are often more frightened than hurt. Doctors cannot take the shortest and best way with us: there must be anæsthetics for the most trifling operations; and no disagreeables. The jam is at least as important as the pill.

It is the same on the spiritual side. Who now preaches hell-fire, or even purgatory? Calvinism is dead: although those of us who were brought up under its shadow have hardly yet had time to draw breath and see how much that was strong and staunch and sober and deep has all but perished with it. The negative precepts of the Evangelicalism of a hundred years ago were costly to keep: and so were the positive demands of the Tractarians fifty years ago. But our popular religion now, even in the Church, makes no tremendous demands on our young people. They must, indeed, be more considerate and careful to avoid giving pain to each other than children were brought up to be fifty years ago: man requires this of them. But God requires little. There is to be no awful crisis of conversion, no agonizing doubts of acceptance, no "dark night of the soul." It is all to be fair weather and sunshine. And the worship of God is not to be made a weariness to the flesh. Services are to be shortened and got through quickly, and are to be at such hours as will not put a strain on physical endurance nor interfere with innocent recreation; and, if possible, they must themselves minister to the

pleasures of the senses. Self-sacrifice, real self-sacrifice, is hardly to be preached by ordinary preachers to ordinary congregations : it is recognized and honoured indeed in the few, but is not to be expected of the many : they are to give what they can spare, and to do for others what they can without inconvenience ; and for the rest, it is, generally speaking, to the greatest happiness of the greatest number that they should take care of their own health and comfort and happiness and that of their belongings. Above all, there must be no mortifications or privations which cannot be seen to be immediately necessary to some useful end. There are, of course, many and splendid exceptions : but even in the Church, to a great extent, much more in some Christian organizations outside the Church,¹ our ordinary popular religion is Christianity without the Cross.

What wonder if a religion out of which the very heart and core are taken should offer little resistance to the vigorous presentment of any one-sided truth ! And so we see people going off to "Christian Science" to get what they ought to have found in the Catholic Church : the spiritual power of rising above bodily pain and conquering nervous weakness ; the love, joy, and peace which are the first fruits of the Spirit of Christ crucified and risen and ascended.

¹ In other countries matters seem to be as bad or worse. In America (*e.g.*), so far back as 1902, " 'When a church has to be run by oysters, ice-cream, and fun,' I read in an American religious paper, 'you may be sure that it is running away from Christ.' Such, if we may judge by appearances, is the present plight of many of our churches." Prof. W. James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 365.

What wonder, again, if people are ready to slip easily into the "New Theology,"¹ which is so pleasingly simple in appearance and fits in so well with their habitual outlook on life and their daily practice.

It would seem, then, that what we need at the moment is to examine the position of Pain in the constitution of things. Stillingfleet complained of Locke that he "had almost discarded Substance out of the reasonable part of the world." So may we, and more justly, complain that Pain is thus generally "discarded" in popular thought. And if erroneously discarded, it is quite certain that people's lives must be the worse for the error; and that the evil results will show themselves even more in the next generation than in this, as the writer of the Second Commandment realized.

I hope to show cause, psychologically, morally, and metaphysically, for believing that Pain has its place, albeit a secondary place, in the eternal essence of things; and the argument will be corroborated by appeal to the Bible and to the witness of the Christian consciousness: that is to say, of the Spirit-bearing Body.

¹ There was a famous criticism made on a certain book: that there was a great deal that was new and a great deal that was true in it; but what was true was not new, and what was new was not true. Would not this criticism apply in great measure to the "New Theology"?

II

PSYCHOLOGY

SUPPOSE that my aim is my own greatest happiness. What is the ideal of this happiness, and how is it to be attained? It is clear that I am not an ideal, but an actual being; and that my happiness must thus be conditioned by my nature as I find it, and by my circumstances as I find them, taking into the largest account any possibilities and potentialities which would still leave me a finite being among other finite beings, living and apprehending my life under conditions, however elastic, of duration and succession. No change, no life.¹

Taking myself then as I stand, to begin with, what do I find? Some pleasures there are, especially those which are characterized as simple and innocent pleasures, which seem to have in them no element of pain: and, probably, the simpler and less reflective the human being, the larger do such pleasures bulk in his total of happiness. A child's seeing "a primrose by the river's brim" may be to him such a pleasure, while to the poet it is part pain. In estimating these things, we must check our own experience,

¹ "Idem semper sentire et non sentire ad idem recidunt." Hobbes.

as well as we can, by what we can gather regarding the experience of other people. But what I think certain is that, as we stand, no human being, however stolid or placid or simple, could afford to lose pain out of his daily experience without incurring an immensely greater loss of happiness.

To begin with, the joys known as "the pleasures of pursuit" would be little worth having if it were not for the element or moment of pain in them. The imminent peril heightens the keen sense of life: the bodily pains of a severe athletic contest or an arduous chase bring out the exhilarating sense of personal vigour and power and skill and self-reliance. There would be no "joy of battle" if the knocks were all on one side. And so it is, not only in physical contests and pursuits, but in mental. Every game of every sort owes its attraction to the risk of the pain of failure.

So Goethe tells us how when a battle was going on, he rode into the line of fire, that he might know what "fire-fever" meant: and he experienced an extraordinary joy in being alive while deadly bullets were whizzing past him.¹

So Satan in *Paradise Lost* exclaims, "Evil, be thou my good;" and we feel the appeal of it. Good is out of reach; and the only tolerable alternative to a strong mind is the choice of the exact opposite, giving at least the keen sense of a continued vigorous personality which cannot be crushed by pain or adversity. It is what the Elizabethans, who knew it well in

¹ *Dichtung u. Wahrheit.*

practice, used to call an *antiperistasis*, a reaction against their surroundings: courage in despair, good cheer in adversity, steadfastness in opposition, in ease and luxury love of hardness, in prosperity a divine discontent, exultation in difficulty, triumphant joy in pain; because "man is man and master of his fate," and all these things make him feel it. It is a joy that springs not from any changing circumstances, but from the man's abiding self. There is a confident security in it which is a continual fount of happiness, in the recognition that in spite of all that fate may do, he has within himself a source of joy which is himself, and which therefore—as it seems to him—he can never lose. He may be broken, and for that he does not care; but he will not bend.

There were giants in the earth in those days; that is true: yet the existence of the British Empire alone is enough to show that their spirit of adventure has never wholly died out. Our boys still hear the call of the sea and of the unknown lands. And there are signs that we, old and young together, are beginning to find our philosophy of painless ease fail us; for our worldly people are seeking relief from its dullness in any excitement they can get, bad, good, or indifferent.

Again, it is significant that, in the world as it is, everything that is worth having is won through pain. This I grant does not in any way justify pain, because we should first have to justify the world, proving that, if not the best of all possible worlds, it is at least a good world; whereas it is

just the presence of pain which makes people think it a bad world. Yet if it does not justify pain, it does show it to be a fundamental fact in the constitution of the world as we find it.

It has been said that every taste worth having is acquired ; that is, generally speaking, won with more or less of pains and pain. As Herbert Spencer and others have abundantly shown, nearly every form of activity is painful in its first exercise, then, generally speaking, becomes pleasant when fully mastered, then becomes mechanical. Even learning to walk is distasteful to some children ; but every child, when it has once found its feet, delights to run and jump, as Pierre Loti tells us of himself, for the mere pleasure of the activity. So with reading, so with every art.

And so it seems to be in the history of every race. Generally speaking, each step in development seems to be gained under the pressure of pain, then to be exercised exultingly while it is a fresh acquisition, and then to count for less and less in the sum-total of pleasures, as in its turn it becomes overlaid by something higher. For example, we are told that birds and four-footed beasts gained their promotion to earth, with all its subsequent advance, by enduring, in the first instance, the deprivation of their sea requirements for the greater part of a month at a time, in the intervals between the tremendous spring tides of early times. And it is certain that their capacity for enjoyment far exceeds that of the sea creatures who stayed behind.

Pain, then, as things are, is seen to be a quite

fundamental condition in the growth of the power of enjoyment.

Again, very low down in the scale of life, it is the pain, the lessening pain, which constitutes the satisfaction of relief; as Socrates noticed when the chain was taken from off his leg. The aching of tiredness it is that makes the pleasure of rest. Right down so low as this, pain, remaining and felt as pain, and therefore an evil in itself, is, by reason of its setting in the whole complex of the moment's experience, an element of the good in that experience.

It is worth stopping to consider this low and simple case, just because it is simple, and because it can be verified in any one's experience. Only we must take care not to import adventitious conditions. For in (*e.g.*) stiffness after riding, the pain may arouse pleasure by stirring up the remembrance of the day's enjoyments; or, after a day of toil and disappointment, it may operate to a perpetual renewal of vexation. We must consider a case where other things, roughly speaking, are equal, so that there is nothing to take into account but the complex of sensations and other physiologically grounded ingredients in our mental state. So doing, I clearly find in my own experience the pain of aching in taking rest to be a spring of pleasure: and this not only when the pain is decreasing, but also when, as usually happens, it is increasing in severity during the first moments of the period of rest. Reflecting on this, I put it down to the submergence of the pain in the sense of—not *well-being* but *well-becoming* (if I may coin such a word): a

sense which depends on the pain for its very existence. The pain is localized, *i.e.* is referred to some part of my organism: the well-becoming belongs chiefly to my whole empirical self;¹ so that it may be said to be a higher, more intimate and fundamental fact than the pain which forms the food for it.

If this is true, we have secured for pain, very low down in the scale of living experience, a footing as not only a means towards good, but as an element or ingredient in good itself. And I believe the reason why this is not generally recognized is our inveterate mental habit—especially in England—of isolating facts for study, and then never putting them together again. It is as if we took for granted that a heavy weight could never act on a hod of bricks but as pressing them down. So it does in itself; but put the weight at the end of a pulley, and it raises the bricks. Is it any wonder, then, that, in an elastic complex such as ourself, the indirect action of any factor or agent should sometimes be the opposite of its direct action?

And no false reasoning can hide from me the plain fact that my spirits do rise in adversity, so long as nobody is doing anything wrong; and that, generally speaking, many sides of life would be exceedingly dull if there were no pain or fear of pain² present.

Now, if this is even partially true where only our own self is concerned, how much more

¹ See Spinoza's *Ethic* for the working out of this distinction and its bearing.

² The fear of pain is pain. "More frightened than hurt."

when other people's good comes in, and our pain may subserve the happiness of those whom we love! Every child knows the joy of carrying a heavy basket to help its mother: and the more its little arms ache, the happier it is to think how much it is helping her. Self-sacrifice is the very life of love's joy; and the staff of its sustenance is pain. Literature, from love-songs upwards, is so full of this truth that there is no need to elaborate it here.

And who that loves does not covet to suffer not only for but with those whom he loves; if he can do nothing for them, yet to be permitted the intimate privilege of sharing their sorrow. It is in fear and trembling that we approach one in great sorrow. Will he reckon us intruders? Will he feel that we, with our other interests outside his, must jar upon him? What are we, that we can suppose our word, our presence, can be acceptable to him? And if so it has been, and we have been allowed to draw near, then we know indeed that there is made between us a silent understanding deep down below words, a mysterious and sacred spiritual communion most precious.

So, even in human relations, we in some measure draw near to the deep religious experience of St. Paul and all the Saints, and we understand in part what St. Theresa meant when she kept crying, "Let me suffer or die."

So far we have been concerned with ourselves and our conditions as we find them. But in truth, I cannot help thinking that in Blessedness—that is, in the highest human good—there

must in the nature of things be an element of pain. Not that the Beatitudes, taken alone, are patient of only that one interpretation. It might be that the poor in spirit were blessed only because hereafter they should enjoy the kingdom which was already theirs by right; and so with the mourners and those which do hunger and thirst after righteousness and them which are persecuted for righteousness' sake. They might be only in the way of training for future happiness. They are this. But surely not only this. We are not heirs but "inheritors of the kingdom of heaven:"¹ that is, it is ours to enjoy now. And the kingdom of God, our Lord said, is "within you."² "For the kingdom of God is . . . righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;"³ and these must be within us, requiring indeed heavenly surroundings for their ideal development, but yet within the breast of each child of God, or nowhere. Blessedness is the becoming more and more after the likeness of God, in whose image we were made, and thereby attaining to an ever closer communion with Him and His.

In this world—whatever it may be in heaven, pain is intimately bound up with this becoming and with its moments of supremest felicity. Many a saint, when God has drawn close, filling him with the joy of love, has cried out to God to stay His hand, because he could bear no more. St. Theresa's "suffering" was half joy; and a saint's joy is part pain. And so are our

¹ Catechism.

² ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν. Luke xvii. 21.

³ Rom. xiv. 17.

best "earthly" joys, of love, and of music, and of all high beauty and loveliness in nature and in art. Groanings which cannot be uttered nor understood are the only language of our heart. "We can hardly tell it from pain," George Eliot says somewhere (I quote from memory) of this joy, "but by recognizing that it is what of all in the world we would choose to have and keep."

Is this element of submerged pain all due to sin or to the flesh? If there were no persecution, and no sin to mourn for; if, as in St. John's vision,¹ all and every evil thing were banished, and if no regret or pity troubled the bliss of the blessed children of the Father, ever righteous and increasingly sanctified; would there be no hungering and thirsting after the Lord their Righteousness? Would there be no sense of the poverty of the finite creature in face of the Infinite Creator?

Whatever it may be with the Living Creatures and the Ancients when they worship God for His Creation, there is a new song, too, which they sing, and every created thing joins with them, and myriads of angels, saying, "Worthy art Thou . . . for Thou wast slain and didst purchase unto God with Thy Blood *men* out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation and madest them unto our 'God a kingdom' and 'priests.'"² And the great multitude of the redeemed take up the burden, "*Salvation* unto our God that is 'seated on the Throne,' and unto the Lamb."³

¹ Rev. xxii. 15.

² Apoc. v. 9: Abp. Benson's trans.

³ Ch. vii. 10.

How can men worship "a Lamb as it had been slain" and have in their joy no touch of sorrow for what slew Him?

No "pain"¹ indeed which they would be rid of do they suffer; no "torment"² such as those endure who suffer or fear hell; no "hunger" or "thirst"³ such as they felt on earth. But surely the Cross can never be forgotten; the pain of the sins from which He freed us by His Blood,⁴ or rather the pain of seeing what our loosing cost Him, must ever be present; only that now, every pulse of that blessed pain only goes to heighten our joy in His Life and His Light and His Love in which we live and move and have our being.

If it is not idle to speculate on what heaven might have been to us if there had been no sin and no redemption, we must think of what little we are told about the angels. Their desire to look into the mysteries of the Gospel⁵ may be painless, although it would be difficult to believe this of the mystery of the Passion and more particularly of the angel-tended agony. They may possibly have what Tennyson calls "a painless sympathy with pain." But it is hardly possible that when "there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels,"⁶ it cost Michael's company nothing. Whatever may be uncertain in the interpretation of this vision, it is at least clear that we are not intended

¹ πόνος. Ch. xxi. 4.

² κόλασις. Matt. xxv. 46; 1 John iv. 18.

³ Rev. vii. 16.

⁴ Rev. i. 5.

⁵ 1 Peter i. 12.

⁶ Rev. xii. 7-12.

to picture the war as a mimic combat, but as a real struggle, involving some sort of pain. It may be that, while the creationward functions of angels involve pain, there is none in their Godward relations. We cannot make more than a guess at these things. Yet the contemplation of the possibility seems to reinforce the conviction that it could not be thus with us human beings, but that pain is a necessary moment in that ever-deepening relation to God which is our blessedness.

For it is not at our worst but at our best that we feel it most keenly.

III

MORALS

If there is a question whether pain has any positive hedonic value, there can be no doubt that it has a certain physiological and moral value. Yet the determination of what this value may exactly be is the very question on which the greatest change has taken place in modern thought and in educational and judicial practice.

To Jeremy Bentham belongs the honour of having made it perfectly clear that what penal jurisprudence has to aim at is not retribution, but to make every man find it to his own interest to keep the law. His teaching is based on a very clearly stated Egoistic Hedonism.¹ "Nature has placed mankind," he says, "under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire:

¹ *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, ch. i. § 1.

but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while."

But while Bentham, writing 120 years ago, puts almost the sole stress on pain, our legislators now are beginning to see how much may be done through the kind offices of man's other sovereign, pleasure, and especially in the form of hope.

So also in the education of children we have come to see that hope will do more than fear, and affection will do more than sternness, in teaching all kinds of lessons. The only question is whether avoidable pain is to have any place at all in education.

It may fairly be said that if it has any moral value for grown-up people, so it will have for children; and conversely: only that the values shift and change in the growth and development of the individual and of the race. Pain can be made use of educationally from many different points of view and in different settings. So, (*e.g.*), if there are unwise teachers who seek to make all processes of learning easy and effortless, there are also wise ones whose methods differ from those of fifty years ago, not by seeking to eliminate painful effort, but by enlisting the pupil's will on the side of effort, encouraging him to enjoy the fight with difficulties, and rewarding him for a hard bit of work by giving him a harder.

Pain is, as a matter of fact, educative in a rudimentary fashion, not only to the lowest race of men or even beasts and birds, but far lower down in the scale of intelligence. The lowly

C

creature which, by chance or not, manages to learn by experience how to respond suitably to different stimulations is the creature which survives and continues its species. Pleasure has induced action, and pain has determined the kind of action, sometimes as inhibition of movement. And pain early begins to be made use of as educative. "Not to do it again" is almost as deliberately taught by the hen who pecks her erring chick as by the savage chief who flogs his tribesman. The savage's advance is in going on to reason from his own methods to his god's, and to infer that when evil comes upon himself, it is that he has done something displeasing to his god. And then he tries to find out *what*.

This stage of *that* and *what* is a long one, in which suffering is borne as a matter of course, without questioning its justice or reflecting on its results. It is a long time before the bayonet begins to think and to ask himself *why* he in particular should be killed or maimed in a quarrel between France and Germany.¹

Then the whole question is opened. Do we deserve it? If we think we do, then it may be simply retributive, God justly paying us out. If not, then either God is unjust or impotent, or there must be some good purpose to us in it. It may be prophylactic, to warn us, to check us, to disable us from going wrong; it may be corrective, to make us think how to amend; it may be stimulating, urging us to

¹ Zola, *La Débâcle*.

efforts which will issue in a greater good. If these are the true explanations, then God must be more than just, He must be beneficent: pain must be meant to teach us the most necessary qualities of endurance, sympathy, and faith, in our three great relations towards God, our neighbour, and the infra-human world.

This is the line along which we shall find the idea of Pain working itself out, according to the natural process of dialectical thought, through the divine inspiration of the saints and thinkers of the Old Testament, justifying to men the ways of God our Righteousness in the spiritual and moral *milieu* made for them by whatever of their Law was at the time in force, Godward and manward.

IV

THE OLD TESTAMENT

It may well be true that the religion of the Hebrews has always been and still is a religion of joy.¹ Thus it is pointed out as a striking fact that in a by no means large vocabulary there are in Hebrew no less than twelve verbs expressing joy.² But in spite of this, or rather by reason of the same underlying truth, no language can well have more words for pain ;³ and it is quite certain that nowhere else is the idea of pain treated with the same vigour, richness, and depth, as in the books of the Old Testament, completed by those of the New.

All the tragedy and all the pathos of Greek literature leave us baffled before pain. The Romans, except where they are influenced by Greek traditions, can only teach us to despise pain. The great Buddhist teachers accept pain

¹ "The keynote of the old Hebrew cult was joy, because it was a communion of man with his God."—Smend, *Religions geschichte*. Quoted in the "Jewish Encyclopædia," art. *Joy*, by K. Kohler, who adds: "Cheerfulness is the keynote of the [modern] Jew's character in his domestic life and in his religious devotion."

² Wünsche, *Die Freude in den Schriften des Alten Bundes*, p. 5.

³ See Appendix, Note A.

as a condition of all particular life; and escape from life is the only salvation they can offer.

But the Jews were able to face pain, because they were taught to face sin. "The Jews were for all the world a sacred school of the knowledge of God and of the ordering of the soul;"¹ and this, not in abstract speculative philosophy, but in practical religion and morals. So there can be no better field than the Old Testament for studying the development of conceptions of the moral and educational values of pain.

Genesis.—The story of the Fall, whensoever written and howsoever arrived at (and it is undoubtedly one of the most primitive stories² and earliest written down), does, by God's wisdom reaching from one end to the other, contain the seed truths of the Gospel. And here we have, etched in, an account of the origin and function of Pain more complete and suggestive than any that is to be met with until much later.

There is first the pain of fear and shame,³ springing spontaneously from the consciousness of transgression. Conscience is awakened, and thence the first pain arises: not inflicted from outside, but coming from the man's own sense that he has broken the law laid down for himself and his surroundings. He himself has broken up his peace.

Then there is the formal sentence of suffering from external conditions,⁴ justly decreed by the

¹ St. Athanasius, *De Incarn.*, c. xii.

² See Appendix, Note B. ³ Gen. iii. 10. ⁴ Vers. 16, 17.

Lord God. And this pain, announced to woman and man alike, is the pain which is the condition of fruitfulness:¹ in the woman, the pangs of childbearing; in the man, the toil and vexations ("thorns and thistles") and chequered success of his cultivation of the fruits of the ground.

Thus there is hope in the sentenced pain. It has regard, not merely, as in the serpent's sentence, to the past offence; but it carries in it the seed of redemption. "A woman when she is in travail, hath sorrow, because her hour is come; but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world."² The sorrow only heightens the joy of the mother's love.

And the enmity declared between man and the serpent carries the same condition, the joy of triumph through pain: the serpent's head is bruised at the cost of the bruising of the heel which tramples thereon.³ But the victor's wounds only enhance his exultation.

The unmixed and stationary pleasures of the garden of Eden are now left behind. Henceforth man is to know the joy of conflict, of climbing through pain to a higher and deeper joy. And though in this story the travail is first and the satisfaction after, yet even in the moment when the pain is keenest, there is sustainment in the

¹ עֲבֹדָה, travail, an uncommon word, only here and in ch. v. 29. "Cf. the use of the cognate עָבַד in Pr. x. 22b; xiv. 23a; v. 10b; Ps. cxxvii. 2."—Driver, *Genesis*.

² John xvi. 21. See Appendix, Note C.

³ Gen. iii. v. 15.

joy that is set before the sufferer and toiler, present already in a very effective sense, in anticipation.

Lastly, the suffering is in part vicarious. It is not only for himself that the man toils. It is for her baby that the woman suffers. So here we have in germ what is afterwards to be developed bit by bit down the ages.

Among other writings generally supposed to be earlier than Amos,¹ there is not much, so far as I can see, of special interest as regards pain. But it is worth noticing the contrast between the blessing of Issachar and that of Joseph.² Issachar chooses ease and pleasure, and becomes "a servant under task work" (R.V.). Joseph, sorely grieved and persecuted, yet becomes strong and fruitful and blessed above all his brethren with blessings which, almost unintelligible though they are, are none the less splendid in emotional effect.

Amos.—Amos does not think that God's election and favour means indulgence. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities."³ Nearness to God is nearness to the fire. Amos cannot bear the people who live in pleasure and luxury and "are not grieved for

¹ Not being in any sense an expert, I have no right to express any views of my own on such questions. Whatever I may myself be inclined to think on any point, I can only go by what I gather is the best opinion.

² Gen. xlix. 14, 15, 22-27.—J.

³ Ch. iii. 2.

the affliction of Joseph."¹ If a remnant of them is rescued,² it will only be after the lion's mauling.

Hosea.—Hosea shows how the Lord's very love, in its yearning for His people, like that of a husband who loves none the less because he has been wronged, makes Him afflict them when nothing else will avail. "I will be unto Ephraim as a lion . . . I, even I, will tear and go away . . . I will go and return to my place till they acknowledge their offence, and seek my face: in their affliction they will seek me earnestly." And so they did. "Come and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up . . . and we shall live before him."³

Micah.—Micah—if Micah it be—sees that if the Lord is to⁴ redeem His people from the hand of their enemies, it can only be when they have been through the pangs of travail in exile: it is at Babylon that they will be rescued. And he, or probably a later writer, has a wonderful gospel: "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy: when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me. I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him; until he plead my cause, and execute judgment for me: he will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold

¹ Ch. vi. 6.

² Ch. iii. 12.

³ Ch. v. 14—vi. 2.

⁴ Ch. iv. 10.

his righteousness."¹ As Dr. Pusey points out,² the force of the original makes the falling—the falling of one who so looks to the Lord—to be not only reversed or done away by a rising, but to be an arising at the very time. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity . . . he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again and have compassion upon us; he will tread our iniquities under foot: and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea."³ The people are now not servants, but children, who can best be reclaimed, not by just punishment, but by the showing forth of the lovingkindness of the Father's heart.

Isaiah i.-xl.—There are people at the very opposite pole for whom pain is not good: at least not at the time; the people who when they are "hardly bestead and hungry" "fret themselves and curse."⁴ And there are others like them who will not suffer⁵ nor mourn when the Lord of hosts calls them to it; but they will eat and drink to-day because to-morrow they will die. And that refusal is a sin which in all their life they will never expiate.

In chapter xxiv., sin, not only against God, but against man, has gone so far as to destroy all the natural pleasure of life. But all the time, to the few poor and needy faithful, the Lord has been a refuge; and after many days of gloom,

¹ Ch. vii. 8. ² *Minor Prophets, in loc.*

⁴ Isa. viii. 21; cf. Rev. xvi. 10.

³ Ch. vii. 18 ff.

⁵ Ch. xxii. 12 ff.

He is able to give back the pleasant things, together with joy in His salvation. "He hath swallowed up death for ever,"¹ they cry.

Chapter xxviii.² shows the impossibility of escape from God's true and just judgements. And chapter xxxv. promises to the faithful gladness and joy with no alloy of any evil thing. That "they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain"³ seems to be Isaiah's ideal of felicity.

Jeremiah.—Jeremiah shows the Lord to be not so much jealous for Himself as grieved that, for all He can do,⁴ rising up early and speaking, the people will sin against their own good. This is Jeremiah's own sorrow. "For the hurt of the daughter of my people am I hurt . . . Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of waters, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people."⁵ And for all this tender sorrow of his "every one of them doth curse"⁶ him. If only the Lord would allow him to keep silence, he could bear his sorrow ; but gentle lamb⁷ that he is, he is compelled to speak, for there is in his heart as it were a burning fire shut up in his bones, and he cannot contain.⁸ Then he turns to God, "Be not a terror unto me: thou art my refuge."⁹ And then he sees¹⁰ that the heart of

¹ Ch. xxv. 8.

² Vers. 14 ff.

³ Ch. xi. 9.

⁴ Ch. vii. 13, 25.

⁵ Ch. viii. 21 ; ix. 1.

⁶ Ch. xv. 10.

⁷ Ch. xi. 19.

⁸ Ch. xx. 9.

⁹ Ch. xvii. 17.

¹⁰ Ch. xxxi.

God is a heart of everlasting love towards both himself who so loves God and to the wayward Ephraim. "Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for as often as I speak against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore my bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord."¹ And the mercy was not only in remitting punishment, but in the putting away of sins: Judah should again be a habitation of justice, and a mountain of holiness.² And "I have satiated the weary soul, and I have replenished every sorrowful soul." No wonder that, after this, "I awaked, and beheld; and my sleep was sweet unto me." The deep of his sorrow had taught him the deep of God's love.

Lamentations.—And so it is with the author or authors of Lamentations: the very same religious experience; so that, if not Jeremiah's, it yet may well be entitled "Lamentations of the sons of Jeremiah" (Cheyne). The true son of God, when the Lord hath afflicted him in the day of His fierce anger, so that he can only cry, "Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow,"³ has nowhere else to turn but to the God, the rod of whose wrath is torturing him.

No sort of suffering is spared him. And from the very extreme of the anguish he takes hope.⁴ "The Lord is my portion, saith my soul;

¹ Ver. 20.

³ Ch. i. 12.

² Vers. 23-26.

⁴ iii. 21.

therefore will I hope in him. The Lord is good unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him. . . . It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth. . . . For the Lord will not cast off for ever. For though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly¹ nor grieve the children of men."²

"Faith and hope and love we see Joining hand in hand"³ indeed in this wonderful poem.

But the wicked who made themselves the ministers of God's affliction are punished with blindness of heart, and perish from under the heavens.⁵

Zephaniah.—There is an interest of a simple kind in Zephaniah's teaching. He is sure that the Lord will punish all the sins against which he prophesies. And he is sure, too, that it is only a matter of persistence in punishing, and the people will be brought round.⁴ There will be left "an afflicted and poor people: and they shall trust in the name of the Lord."⁶ Then when, through this discipline, they have learned to trust, they will find gladness. And then the Lord their God will have His own joy. "He will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing."⁷ It is

¹ "Heb. *from his heart*." R.V. margin.

³ Bp. Chr. Wordsworth.

⁵ Ch. iii. 7, 8.

⁷ iii. 17.

² Ch. iii. 24-33.

⁴ Vers. 65, 66.

⁶ iii. 12.

If these verses are later, they at any rate fit in perfectly and complete the picture.

one of the loveliest little pictures of God's ways with men.

Habakkuk.—Habakkuk shows the value of a long-enduring trust in the living, holy, everlasting Lord God. The Lord does not really favour the bitter and hasty. Although He holds His peace when the wicked swalloweth up the righteous, although He makes men as the fishes of the sea, that have no ruler over them : yet Habakkuk is sure that He is of purer eyes than to behold perverseness; and he reasons that it is for correction and judgement that the Lord has appointed the Chaldæans. And therefore he believes that when the correction, however severe, is accomplished, then the instrument will be destroyed, but the just will live by his faithfulness.

If the Prayer was written by Habakkuk, we have in it, I think, the earliest explicit confession of rejoicing¹ *in the Lord* " (צִיְהוֹה). To rejoice *before* the Lord was the common conception, giving thanks and praise to Him for all His mercies and good gifts, and this may sometimes be described as rejoicing *in His salvation*. But here, in spite of the privation and distress of famine, and although God gives no promise of prosperity, yet His saint can cry, "I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." And this passage is far stronger than any

¹ Ch. iii. 18 ; cf. Joel ii. 23. But (supposing Joel to be early) I think the context shows that the passage = rejoice in His salvation. See Isa. lxi. 10 ; Zech. x. 7 ; 1 Sam. ii. 1 ; Luke i. 47 ; and several Psalms.

of its parallels. It is one thing to rejoice in the God who is giving us every good gift. It is quite another to rejoice in God when He strips us bare of everything but Himself.

Ezekiel.—The Book of Ezekiel is full of hedonic interest. The prophet's soul is vexed to see the wrong people happy: the soul of the righteous made sad with lies; the shepherds not feeding the flock, but feeding on it; the fat and strong cattle not content to take all they want, but fouling the residue for the broken and sick. It is with no pain, like Jeremiah, but almost with a fierce joy that he prophesies against the prophets who cry peace, and tells them that their sham wall shall break down and destroy them in its fall. Not that God hath any pleasure in the death of him that dieth. God would have him turn. But if he will not turn, he had better die than live in unrighteousness.

But the special problem for Ezekiel was that of vicarious suffering. It may be that the dividing of the nation by the Captivity, however keenly patriotic the exiles may have been, had in some degree broken up their sense of solidarity: and I cannot help thinking that the new learning of the Babylonians may have produced an uprising of strong individualism such as that of a Renaissance or Illumination. At any rate, while accepting the fact, people were questioning the justice of God's visiting the sins of the fathers on the children. Why should we in this generation be punished for the sins which our fathers committed before we were born?

Why should I be punished for my neighbour's sins? Or even for my own sins, if I could not have known better, and it was the prophet's fault for not warning me? The way of the Lord is not equal.

Ezekiel answers boldly by denying the supposed fact, or rather its interpretation. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," and no other. He goes methodically through the different cases, reiterating this conclusion. Nor, on the other hand, is there vicarious merit: though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in the land, they should deliver but their own souls for their righteousness. He goes even further. A righteous man must not presume on his past righteousness, nor must an unrighteous man despair because of his sins. The righteous¹ may fall at the last, and "die"; and the wicked may at any time turn from his wickedness, and "live."

I do not think that Ezekiel meant to deny the truth of the Second Commandment, or the truth that it was because of the false worship and unrighteousness of their fathers that they found themselves in exile. Not vicarious suffering, but vicarious guilt and obnoxiousness to punishment was what he meant to deny. If the exiles would turn to God, He would welcome them, and they should "live." It was entirely the fault of each one of them if he found his life not worth living. The Lord God had no pleasure in the death of him that dieth.

¹ Ch. xviii. 26. But the text is difficult. At *some* crisis, the man's fate will be determined by the attitude in which it finds him.

It is a curious thing that Ezekiel's own life, according to his own account, was a signal instance or exhibition of vicarious suffering. For a sign to the house of Israel of the siege of Jerusalem, he was to lie upon his left side, and "lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it . . . thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have appointed the years of their iniquity to be unto thee a number of days, even three hundred and ninety days : so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel."¹ Then on his right side, forty days, in like manner. Moreover, he was to eat his bread with quaking, and drink his water with trembling.² Moreover, his wife, the desire of his eyes, was taken away from him with a stroke ; for a sign. And he obeyed in all this. The only command against which he did protest was one which went against his conscience.³

He was of extraordinary eloquence, so that people enjoyed listening to his words as to a very lovely song.⁴ Yet that eloquence effected but little for their salvation. More effectual was his dumb suffering.⁵

Zechariah.—Haggai's preaching is rather of work than of suffering or enjoyment. So perhaps is Zechariah's, in the earlier chapters of the book. There is a curious note⁶ of the Lord's displeasure against the nations that are at ease,

¹ Ch. iv. 1 ff.

³ Ch. iv. 12.

⁶ Ch. iii. 26.

² Ch. xii. 18.

⁴ Ch. xxxiii. 32.

⁶ Ch. i. 15.

because when the Lord was but a little displeased with Jerusalem, they helped forward the affliction. And Zechariah is commissioned to encourage the cities of Judah with promises of renewed prosperity. The fasts, in the good time to come, shall be turned into festivals.

In the later chapters, there is more about suffering, and very solemn. "They shall look upon me¹ whom they have pierced: and they shall mourn for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first born."² That is a mourning which prepares the way for cleansing.³ And there are mysterious wounds "between the hands"⁴ of a mysterious personage, mysteriously inflicted. And the Lord of hosts calls on the sword to awake against His shepherd, and against the man that is His fellow,⁵ (the same for whose price thirty pieces of silver was weighed and cast to the potter?) And through all this, the remnant, the third part, of the people, shall be brought as through the fire to God. These are hints, strangely vivid, of the power of suffering; yet surrounded with darkness until they can be seen in the light of the Cross.

Daniel.—In Daniel we are taught the efficacy of voluntary pain, such as fasting and sackcloth and ashes, in prayer and above all in intercession;⁶ and also at least one reason of its efficacy:⁷ that it is our setting ourselves in our right place, alongside of the worst sinners. It is our humble

¹ Marg. *him*.

² Ch. xii. 10.

³ Ch. xiii. 1.

⁴ Ch. xiii. 6.

⁵ Ch. xiii. 7.

⁶ Ch. ix. 3; x. 2, 3.

⁷ Ch. ix. 20.

acknowledgment of this plain truth about ourselves. We are not interceding as superior people in a position of vantage, but as poor sinners deserving punishment and needing all God's mercy. Fasting of course is no new practice; but it is in Daniel of all the Old Testament books that the practice is set in its clearest light.

THE QUASI-PHILOSOPHICAL BOOKS

(*Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Job.*)

The Jew is not at home in abstract intellectual speculation;¹ his avenue to truth is through the worship and service of a righteous God, a God of faithfulness and truth: and so the quasi-philosophical writings of the Old Testament and Apocrypha are on the whole disappointing.²

Proverbs.—From Proverbs there seems little to gather beyond the reinforcement from every variety of experience of the truth that

“ It's wiser being good than bad,
It's safer being meek than fierce,
It's fitter being sane than mad ; ”³

and some good observations⁴ on the beneficial effects of cheerfulness.

¹ The phenomenon of Spinoza's philosophy, if it were not out of place to examine it here, would perhaps be seen to be an exception of the sort which proves the rule.

² I had intended and begun to go through the books of the Apocrypha: but this chapter is already too long; and some of those books, if dealt with at all, should be treated at some length. Esdras II. (*e.g.*) ought to have a whole essay written on it. So I have given it up.

³ Browning, “ Apparent Failure.”

⁴ *E.g.* ch. xv. 15, and xvii. 22.

Ecclesiastes.—So is it even with Ecclesiastes, in spite of the thoroughness with which it sets out deliberately to investigate Happiness.

There are two methods of inquiry, and both lead to the same pessimistic result.

The author goes to work experimentally, having every advantage that personality and position can give him, to seek pleasures or occupations or interests which shall make life worth living, and finds none : life can be made at best tolerable, after the first heyday of unthinking youth is past. Pain predominates. All is vanity. Empirically, all that can be done is to take what comes and make the best of it, being careful to avoid excess in every respect.

The speculative method yields no better satisfaction. God may have His good ; but man can have no part in it, nor knowledge of it. The affairs of the world move in a closed circle, so that there can be no real advance and no hope. If an individual were minded to give up seeking his own happiness and to throw himself into doing good, there is no good to be done : for all is vanity. There is no practical outlet. Nor is there any ideal refuge from private failure to be found in the contemplation of the order of Creation. All is vanity. Not to think too deeply on deep subjects is his palliative.

So the book's contribution to the philosophy of hedonics is negative. For no faculties of man, from the lowest to the highest, nor for the whole man, nor for the world, is there any good.

And this seems to me a valuable contribution, as giving the reasoned conclusions of a

Jew who lacked moral enthusiasm and vital religion. It is quite true : for such an one there is no good. And it is profitable for us to be taught this.

There is another point worth noting. When the Preacher had fully satisfied himself that all was vanity, he did not turn selfish altogether : he helped others both by teaching and by liberal alms ; and, it would seem, not by inconsistent impulse, but "because he was wise." At the lowest, pure selfishness is imprudent and defeats itself.

Job.—Job, although it also specifically attempts a contribution to the philosophy of pain, yet is not so much a philosophical as an essentially religious book. The story is an account of a very simple religious experience. Job could have borne any afflictions, however grievous, if only his happy trustful communion with God had been left him ; but he lost that, through the provocation of his friends leading him to justify himself at God's expense. And when at last the light of God's Presence, albeit in reproof, was restored to him, he was satisfied. Stripped, desolate, sick, misunderstood, despised though he still was, he was at peace and asked no more : no explanation and no restoration of earthly blessings. God was all in all to him.

And that is, I believe, the central thought of the writer ; for no one could have invented it who did not know it by experience. "Lord, Thou hast made us for Thyself."

But the writer's aim was to save men from so dire a desolation by refuting one hard and

dreary theory of suffering, and by suggesting another, in which might be found comfort and even inspiration. The friends held the ordinary current or traditional view that prosperity and adversity were meted out by God according to a man's desert; (and also, of course, that adversity would do him good, properly submitted to.) But Job, since his calamities had come on him, had learned for certain that this was not so; for he had a crucial instance to the contrary in his own person. "There was none like him on the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feared God, and eschewed evil."¹ And he knew that he had lived a good life.² Yet here he was in misery.

So the argument works itself out, beginning with gentle considerateness, and growing fiercer and more sharply opposed as it proceeds. It is an interesting piece of logic. The friends' theory of retribution is apparently based on *à priori* considerations: God being just must needs deal thus and thus. Any apparent exception must be due to our ignorance of the man's real desert. And on the grounds of God's greatness and man's littleness and ignorance they argue that Job cannot disprove their theory. Job on the same grounds argues that they cannot prove it. On which side lies the *onus probandi*? Clearly on that of the friends. Therefore Job is in the right. The friends' is a typical case of bad logic and therefore bad theology. Their view was, indeed, *prima facie* to be accepted because it had the nine points of possession on its side; but

¹ Job i. 8.² Chs. xxvi.-xxxii.

their temper in holding it was that of "tant pis pour les faits," in face of what they knew of Job's past life and in face of his own emphatic and obviously sincere declarations, backed up by the citation of many other such instances.

Where Job was mistaken was in accepting part of their premisses: that suffering can never be inflicted but in displeasure, and that there can be little good in it. From this it necessarily follows that God is unjust in making him suffer. And in his misery and exasperation he is ready to go beyond this, attributing to God a malicious pleasure in using His almighty power wantonly and immorally.

It is the finest touch in the poem that, when God at last answers Job out of the whirlwind, He gives him no intellectual satisfaction; He simply takes up and reinforces what both Job and the friends have already dwelt on, His own stupendous greatness and wisdom, passing man's comprehension. Then it is brought home to Job that, while he was so confidently and bitterly accusing God of injustice, it was he himself who was unjust to God. He sees now that man cannot judge God: and he abhors himself in dust and ashes for his presumption and disloyalty. And then God acknowledges him as His faithful servant; and Job is at peace.

Job himself was content to give up his old rationale of retribution and do without any theory at all, content to trust and love God and be loved. But that is the way of a saint. All men cannot take it. So the writer shows that if Job had been able to see behind the

scenes, he would have recognized a good, benevolent, loving purpose in his afflictions: the ripening of his own faith; and "to try his patience for the example of others, and that his faith might be found in the day of the Lord laudable, glorious, and honourable,"¹ to the wholesome confusion of Satan and of his own friends. And the author shows us God acting, as we should say, justly, rewarding Job seven-fold for what He made him go through primarily for Satan's benefit.

That is the new theory. Pain may sometimes be, and be intended to be, for the good and happiness of the sufferer and of others through him; being sent him, not because he is worse, but because he is better than other people; so that God in sending it is more than just:—He is merciful. And, rightly borne, it avails for good not only on earth, but also in the unseen world.

The Psalms.—There are three Psalms which expressly deal with the problem of pain. The first, the 37th, might perhaps be classed among the quasi-philosophical writings, being an alphabetical Psalm, and more or less proverbial in its method and tone. It seems to find the good man's reward in the success of his family on the whole. "Such as are blessed of God shall possess the land: and they that are cursed of Him shall be rooted out."² The truly fittest survive.

The next, the 49th, goes deeper, and the

¹ Visitation of the Sick.

² Ver. 22.

Psalmist is evidently aware that he is going below current conceptions,¹ and his speech after all is "dark," either because he himself felt his new truth strongly rather than saw it clearly, or because he did not wish to lay it open to fools and wise alike. No one knows better than he that virtue is often a hindrance to success in life, and that "nothing succeeds like success." It might have been Mephistopheles saying, "So long as thou doest well unto thyself, men will speak good of thee."² Nor (even if they could take comfort in it) is it true that the good can count on the pseudo-immortality of the great.³ What then? Nothing in this life. But hereafter, while the godless remain in dreary Sheol, and never more see light, "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol: for He shall receive⁴ me."⁵ There is heaven for the individual.

The last of the triad, Psalm 73, rings high and clear in comparison. There is the same theoretical difficulty; "I do also see the ungodly in such prosperity:"⁶ and it is brought home to the Psalmist, as to holy Job, by his being chastened and plagued continually, in spite of his cleansed heart and innocent hands.⁷ No more than the Preacher could he by philosophical reflection understand this; it was too hard for him.⁸ Then he went where, as he knows, he ought to have gone at first, into the sanctuary of God. There in the light of the Lord he saw

¹ Vers. 1-5.

³ Vers. 10-13.

⁶ Vers. 14-20, R.V.

⁷ Vers. 12-13.

² Ver. 18.

⁴ Or *take*.

⁶ Ver. 3.

⁸ Ver. 6.

light. God was watching the wicked, and their latter end should be a catastrophe; destruction, desolation, and terror; and, worst of all, God would despise their image. "But as for me, I am alway by Thee: for Thou hast holden me by my right hand. Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel: and after that receive me with¹ glory. Whom have I in heaven but Thee: and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever."² Both here and hereafter, "not Thine but Thee."

All through the Book of Psalms the problem keeps coming up: and it may suffice to take as samples of the whole the Penitential Psalms³ and the five Psalms which the Prayer-book, following antiquity, appoints for Good Friday.⁴

"The Seven Psalms," according to precedent, have the greatest in the centre of the arch, the marvellous fifty-first Psalm, which is indeed a key to the spirit of them all. "I acknowledge my faults: and my sin is ever before me. Against Thee only have I sinned": (though he had sinned against man and woman and the whole people, yet to have sinned against God was what broke his heart) "and done this evil in Thy sight:" (and little did he care for

¹ Or *to*.

² Vers. 23-26.

³ Ps. 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143.

⁴ Pss. 22, 40, 54, 69, 88. It shows what abundance of this line of Messianic prophecy is found in the Psalms that Ps. 31, which actually contains the dying words of Christ, can be left out, having been from early times appropriated to Compline.

human condemnation in comparison). To Thee "I acknowledge my faults . . . that Thou mightest be justified in Thy saying, and clear when Thou art judged."¹

The sinner who has seen God's goodness and his own sin does not ask why he is made to suffer. Any temporal punishment which God can put upon him is as nothing to the worm and fire of his conscience while God's face is turned away from him. Yet he knows he deserves even that turning away; and he can only plead for mercy at the hands of a God of great goodness.

So we find, not explicitly indeed in Psalms vi. and cii., but clearly implied, and in the other four² explicitly, a deep consciousness of sin and consequent obnoxiousness to punishment. And yet all the way through, the Psalmist is emphatically the Lord's. The penitent sinner is *toto cælo* removed from "the ungodly." When we can say from our heart "and we indeed justly," we are not far from Christ and Paradise.

In the Good Friday Psalms we are facing a very different and more mysterious aspect of pain, the suffering of the innocent.³ As this is what we have already considered in Job, Isaiah, and other books, it will be only necessary to notice any strikingly new elements in these Psalms.

¹ If this is taken as active, the sense is the same: God is justified.

² xxxii. 5, 6; xxxviii. 3, 4, 5, 18; cxxx. 3; cxliii. 2.

³ See Appendix, Note D.

There are none, I think, in Psalm liv., beautiful though it is. Psalm lxxxviii. is unique in its absolute hopelessness. The wonder is that the Church should have dared to put such a Psalm into the mouth of the Prince of Life. Yet the Psalms were written, Father Benson tells us,¹ primarily to be His Prayer-book. And we may thank God that, at our very worst, there is a Psalm which we can say from beginning to end, and mean it; and yet be in fellowship with our Lord. It at least teaches us not to be hopeless because we are hopeless.

The three greater Good Friday Psalms savour more of Jeremiah than of Isaiah: and one would give much to know whether "the Second Isaiah" had them before his mind when he sought to God and God "made music through him" in the foretelling of the Passion. But it is the same truth as in the Servant passages; the innocent and godly, the willing servant and true lover of God, bearing not only all that human malice can heap upon him, but, far more terrible, the rebuke of God and even His forsaking. And through his faithfulness he wins joy and redemption not only for himself, not only for the Lord's congregation, the seed of Jacob, but even for all mankind. "All the ends of the world shall remember themselves and be turned unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Him."² To a people yet unborn shall the righteousness of the Lord be declared, and they shall be His people.

¹ *Warsongs of the Prince of Peace.*

² Ps. xxii. 27.

Isaiah xl. to end.—May it not be that to Ezekiel we owe, in great measure, the deepest thoughts in Isaiah? Ezekiel is one of those clear systematic thinkers who so honestly show their own limitations as clearly to suggest the way of overstepping them, positively to invite the next step in the pursuit of truth: such as teach us perhaps more by their failures than by their successes. Whatever the date¹ of the later chapters of Isaiah, they must be later than Ezekiel. And the writer must almost for certain have known the writings of Ezekiel. What would such a mind have felt when he thought over those clear-cut, methodical denials of vicarious punishment? "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; and no other. Was that, as a matter of experience, true? As Ezekiel put it, it belonged to God's justice that it should be true. So it would be, if the death were imposed upon the innocent man by an authority without him. But what if—and here the fire begins to glow—what if it was the man's own heart that desired and willed it? Ezekiel himself had suffered vicariously, willingly and effectually. So, and far more, had Jeremiah. What if a Divine foolishness should be wiser than human common-sense, and there should be a Divine weakness stronger than men!

And so to the Christ-like heart of the prophet it began to be revealed what was the highest

¹ For the present purpose, it does not matter whether they have one author or several: nor does it matter whether it is the nation or the remnant or an individual who is the starting-point for the delineation of the ideal Servant.

way and work of the Lord's Servant. It was the way and work of redemptive suffering.

The best way, perhaps, of showing this is to give the later portions of the Servant passages¹ themselves; because no one can read them without seeing this in them.

The Servant has shown² himself Divinely strong and patient, wise and gentle. He has proclaimed and taught God's³ righteousness throughout the inhabited world. And now he goes on to a high and mysterious work.

“My Lord Jehovah hath opened mine ear.

I was not rebellious,

Nor turned away backward.

My back I have given to the smiters,

And my cheek to tormentors;

My face I hid not from insults and spitting.

But my Lord Jehovah shall help me;

Therefore, I let not myself be rebuffed:

Therefore I set my face like a flint,

And know that I shall not be shamed.

Near is my Justifier; who will dispute with me?

Let us stand up together!

Who is mine adversary?

Let him draw near me.

Lo! my Lord Jehovah shall help me;

Who is he that condemns me?

Lo! like a garment all of them rot;

The moth doth devour them.”

¹ xlii. 1-3; xlix. 1-7; l. 4-10; lii. 13-end of liii.

² xlii. 1-4.

³ xlii. 1 ff.; xlix. 1-7.

⁴ l. 5-10; lii. 13-end, and liii., tr. Dr. G. A. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*.

I.

“ Behold, my Servant shall prosper,
Shall rise, be lift up, be exceedingly high.
Like as they that were astonied before thee
were many,
—So marred from a man's was his visage,
And his form from the children of men!—
So shall the nations he startles be many,
Before him shall kings shut their mouths.
For that which had never been told them they
see,
And what they had heard not, they have to
consider.

II.

Who gave believing to that which we heard,
And the arm of Jehovah to whom was it bared ?
For he sprang like a sapling before Him,
As a root from the ground that is parched ;
He had no form nor beauty that we should
regard him,
Nor aspect that we should desire him.
Despised and rejected of men,
Man of pains and familiar with ailing,
And as one we do cover the face from,
Despised, and we did not esteem him.

III

Surely our ailments he bore,
And our pains he did take for his burden.
But we—we accounted him stricken,
Smitten of God and degraded.

Yet he—he was pierced for crimes that were
ours,
He was crushed for guilt that was ours,
The chastisement of our peace was upon him,
By his stripes healing is ours.
Of us all like to sheep went astray,
Every man to his way we did turn,
And Jehovah made light upon him
The guilt of us all.

IV.

Oppressed, he did humble himself,
Nor opened his mouth—
As a lamb to the slaughter is led,
As a sheep 'fore her shearers is dumb—
Nor opened his mouth.
By tyranny and law was he taken ;
And of his age who reflected,
That he was wrenched from the land of the
living,
For My people's transgression the stroke was
on him ?
So they made with the wicked his grave,
Yea with the felon his tomb.
Though never harm had he done,
Neither was guile in his mouth.

V.

But Jehovah had purposed to bruise him,
Had laid on him sickness ;
So if his life should offer guilt offering,
A seed he should see, he should lengthen his
days.

And the purpose of Jehovah by his hand
should prosper,
From the travail of his soul shall he see,
By his knowledge be satisfied.
My Servant, the Righteous, righteousness
wins he for many,
And their guilt he takes for his load.
Therefore I set him a share with the great,
Yea, with the strong shall he share the spoil :
Because that he poured out his life unto death,
Let himself with transgressors be reckoned ;
Yea, he the sin of the many hath borne,
And for the transgressors he interposes."

Perhaps the only thing which needs to be pointed out in this connection is the well-known fact that, throughout "Second Isaiah," what is said of the Lord's Servant is also said of the Lord in all essentials. If the Servant is Divine in his character and work, so is the Servant's God human.¹ The two strains are so closely interwoven and their colour so alike that, if the prophet did not say, we should not know whether of the two was in his mind.

"I and my Father are one." That is the only really sufficient explanation. And indeed in these wonderful writings, which turn our mind dizzy in their depth and height, but which our heart embraces, we are already in the new world of the New Testament.²

¹ lxiii. ; lix. 15-18 ; lxii. 5 ; etc.

² There are other interesting points in the treatment of pain in these chapters ; but only such as can be fairly paralleled in other Old Testament writings.

V

THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. **St. Paul.**—We have roughly and slightly traced the idea of Pain through the Old Testament. At first closely connected with death and destruction—destruction of the wicked for the preservation of others, the good,—we have seen recognized in it by degrees elements of good to the sufferers themselves, so far as they have been able to accept and profit by it. It has been found to be prophylactic, corrective, stimulating, keeping us from a greater evil, or leading us to a higher good. It has been the necessary condition of all man's conquests over the world and over himself, the obstruction out of which, by God's grace, he has built himself a ladder heavenward.

All this and more still it is in the New Testament, and on all these grounds it is justified by the New Testament writers, as indeed we still need it to be justified.

More than this, it still is retributive¹ and

¹ A true development does not drop out and lose its original elements, but takes them up into a larger complex : they are still there, enriching the whole, only changed in aspect as well as in relative value. *E.g.* if we Christians do not now require that our enemy shall be paid out, we shall never cease to desire

deterrent, and more plainly and awfully so than under the Old Dispensation. In this, as in all else, Christ came¹ not to destroy but to fulfil the Law. From His lips came more awful threatenings of woe than from any of the old prophets. He takes up their language and reinforces it. His requirements are far more exacting. "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."² And that means being cast into the prison whence "thou shalt by no means come out till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing. . . . And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell."³

Rightly does the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews sum up this our Lord's teaching when he says, "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they [of the Exodus] escaped not . . . much more shall not we escape, . . . for our God is a consuming fire."⁴ So St. Paul can put his exhortation to forbearance on that ground: "For it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."⁵

St. Paul is the apostle of pain. "Through to suffer for it ourselves when we find that we ourselves have injured some one.

¹ Matt. v. 17.

² Ver. 20.

³ Vers. 26, 29.

⁴ Heb. xii. 25, 26, 29. R.V.

⁵ Rom. xii. 19.

many tribulations" is his teaching from first to last, "through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God."¹ So he keeps showing in detail, at every opportunity. And therefore, even on this lower ground of the good which it does us, he can say, "Let us rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but let us also rejoice in our tribulations: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, probation; and probation, hope."² And what he commends to others, he carries out abundantly himself. At his conversion he had asked the Lord what He would have him to do, and the Lord had answered by showing him also "how many things he must suffer for His name's sake."³ Surely no one ever went through so many outward sufferings. "In labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by my own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches."⁴ It is an almost

¹ Acts xiv. 22.² Rom. v. 3, 4. R.V.³ Acts ix. 16. R.V.⁴ 2 Cor. xi. 23-29.

incredible record for perhaps not more than twelve or thirteen years. But he knows that it is through these things that the Lord's work is effected. "Therefore," he goes on, "I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake : for when I am weak, then am I strong."¹

His many involuntary fastings and watchings were not enough for him. He added more;² partly, he says, for his own good; ³chiefly, one must think, to reinforce and express his intercessions. Like Daniel, he would set himself among his fellow-sinners. And surely they meant something even beyond this, as when he most solemnly asseverates "that I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake."⁴ "Brethren, my heart's desire and my supplication to God is for them, that they may be saved."⁵ Surely the putting himself to pain in his intercession is the expression of this willingness to suffer anything whatever which, in ways intelligible to him or not, might be bound up with the granting of his supplication. And it would also naturally be the simple, spontaneous expression of this great sorrow and pain in his heart. Who can feast and sleep soundly in great sorrow? And so the natural instinct is taken up into the Christian life, to work in the highest regions, we know not

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 10.

² 1 Thess. iii. 10 ; Acts xiv. 23.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 27.

⁴ Rom. ix. 2, 3. R.V.

⁵ Ch. x. 1. R.V.

how, in the carrying out of¹ Christ's work of salvation.

In all these ways pain is for good.

There remains the problem of the pain of living creatures below man. And St. Paul nowhere comes nearer to our twentieth-century mind and heart than in his sympathy with this. There is no passage in his writings that has a more haunting fascination—partly because of its mystery—than Romans viii. 18–28. The Psalms are full of sympathy with the joy of creation. But St. Paul, like us, feels its pain. And he pictures creation as somehow sharing in the pain of man. He seems to connect its pain with the Fall:² its pain is the travail³ there spoken of, and its earnest expectation is for the revealing of the sons of God. Not of its own will is "Nature red in tooth and claw with ravine." He pictures it as aware of its own vanity, its purposelessness in itself, and as groaning under its millionfold pangs and their aimlessness. What wonder, when even we who, having the first fruits of the Spirit, can see a great purpose, yet groan within ourselves, living on only in hope. What wonder, when even the Spirit Himself, making intercession for saints according to God, intercedes with groanings that cannot be uttered.

Yet St. Paul is like the Italian peasant putting his ear to the snow-covered ground and hearing the spring coming. Through this threefold groaning, creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the

¹ Col. i. 24.

² *ἐκτάση*, v. 20.

³ *συνωδίνει*, v. 22.

glory of the children of God, "according to God."

What is this liberty? The only certain answer that we can give barely touches the fringe of the question: that nature is in fact suffering through man's sin. Rank weeds follow his cultivation; his horrible towns destroy even the very weeds and banish almost every good bird and beast; his destruction of life, even of rare plants and animals, is more wanton than any wild beast's; he abuses the fine qualities of his horses and other beasts of burden, making them serve his purposes to the utmost, and then letting them perish miserably. These and worse things men do to God's creatures, more like children of the devil than sons of God. And we do not know whether these very creatures, so faithful, so helpless, so ill used, hereafter have, like Lazarus, their good things for the evil.

But when at last the redeemed and adopted sons of God are revealed, will there be any "lower creatures"? We can only hope so. And can there be a Millennium, when the¹ lion shall eat straw like the ox, and they shall not hurt nor destroy, so that there shall be no alloy of pain, but yet the interest and joy of living growth? We can hope it may be so. For we can see that to a creature which had lived its span of life, and come to a full end, death might be like a child's falling asleep after a happy day. Or there might be the continual upspringing of new lives, and no death: for there is room in the universe. These are things which we cannot

¹ Isa. xi. 1-10; lxv. 17-end.

even guess at. But of the dumb creatures as well as of ourselves St. Paul, I venture to hope, means us to "reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us-ward." And we may go on to the end of the passage,¹ and, trusting the love of God for ourselves, trust it for the dumb creatures.

2. **The Cross.**—Where did St. Paul learn his doctrine of pain? From the Cross. The cardinal point of his preaching is "Jesus Christ and Him crucified."² That great fact of the Cross is indeed the key to the spiritual understanding of pain. (Just as, conversely, it is often pain which first gives us any understanding of the Cross.) Coming into a world of sin and death and pain, our Saviour saved us from sin by taking upon Himself our sin; He conquered death for us by dying Himself: and He made atonement for us, not indeed by, but yet through, His own suffering.

He, the captain of our salvation, was made perfect through sufferings.³ By the things which He suffered He learned obedience,⁴ just as He learned every other human perfection more and more completely until at last there was no more to be learned. Before His Passion, He could say, "I have finished the work";⁵ but not until, through His obedience,⁶ the whole bitterness of death had been tasted, could He say, "It is finished."⁷ He was Love Incarnate;⁸ and there

¹ Ver 39.

³ Heb. ii. 10.

⁶ John xvii. 4.

⁷ τετέλεσται, John xix. 30.

² 1 Cor. ii. 2.

⁴ Heb. v. 8.

⁶ Phil. ii. 8.

⁸ 1 John iv. 8, 16.

is no way in which human love can be perfected and proved but by self-sacrifice, the willing acceptance of suffering for the sake of others.

Nor, it would seem, is there any way in which love can work so strongly and effectually. To take St. John's interpretation of our Lord's life and death: He worked signs, but they were of no avail to convince men; He taught, speaking as never man spake; He showed a pattern of a perfect life and appealed to that, in vain; His personal influence failed. And all these things so carefully described by St. John must represent a genuine not unhopeful effort to convert Jerusalem: otherwise there would be an intolerable hollowness in (*e.g.*) the disputations in chapters vii.-x. All His works and words and life were a manifold appeal to the hearts and understanding and will of His people. All failed. Then He turned to suffering. When He could not save them from those awful crimes, He would save them through those very crimes. So "the world's Redeemer conquered By surrendering of His life." The cross was the battlefield on which perfect love met the hate of the evil one;¹ and the victory was won once for all, not by might nor by power, but by the voluntary endurance of all the pain that could be heaped up on the head of the Son of Man.²

That victory won for us the transformation of pain.

"The body of sin,"³ death,⁴ he that had the

¹ John xvii. 15; 1 John ii. 13, 14.

² See Appendix, note E., on the Atonement.

³ Rom. vi. 6.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 26; 2 Tim. i. 10.

power of death,¹ were, according to St. Paul's favourite expression,² "brought to nothing," destroyed, had their venom drawn, by the death of Christ. And one would perhaps expect to find pain among these and the other evil things which were then done away. But St. Paul takes higher ground, the ground which, according to St. John, our Lord Himself took in comforting His disciples, "Your sorrow shall be turned into joy:"³ not, shall give place to joy or be succeeded by joy, but the sorrow itself becomes joy; not passing away, but remaining as at least material for the joy. So St. Paul. This is the burden of the magnificent paradoxes into which he keeps breaking out. "In much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report; as deceivers and yet true; as unknown and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened and not killed; as sorrowful yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."⁴ So it is with his weakness, with the foolishness of his preaching, with everything which is contrary to worldly prosperity,

¹ Heb. ii. 14. ² καταργεῖν.

³ γένησεται, John xvi. 20.

⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 4-11.

everything which in the days of his good life under the law he would have reckoned evils. Now all is changed. What things were gain to him, he now counts loss, yea, dung;¹ and the ills are his gain, because, suffering them for Christ, they are become the material of the joy of self-sacrifice. More than even this—for even in this there may be some of self—they are that through which he, being made conformable to Christ's death, comes to know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings.² "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."³ The pain of the crucifixion is there, and is felt as pain, but it is submerged in the exceeding joy of the union with Christ. It only heightens the joy.

3. **Summary.**—In the Bible we have traced pain from its early connection with sin and death to its happy issues as a moment in the triumphs of joyous life and love. And our ethical study of good and evil in the form of right and wrong has brought us to the same conclusion as our psychological study of good and evil in the shape of pleasure and pain. For man certainly, who knows sin, pain is bound up with his highest and deepest joy. The greater he is, the greater is his capacity for pain; the nobler and the more loving and lovely, the more deeply and fully does he enter into those relations of beauty and love in which pain is a necessary moment. Indeed, his whole development and ascent might be

¹ Phil. iii. 7, 8.

² Ch. iii. 10.

³ Gal. ii. 20.

characterized as an exchanging of pleasure for joy of pleasures, in which the pain, if any, is a negligible quantity, for joys which he can hardly bear.

And if this belongs to man's perfection ; and if man occupies the high place which St. Paul assigns him in the cosmos¹ of all but infinitely varied spiritual beings² whom we sometimes with so little discrimination speak of as "angels": then we must suppose that the Cross has some intelligible significance for all this spiritual cosmos.

We are sometimes told that Christianity is only a planetary religion. And this may be true as to our planetary way of understanding it in this life, as it is certainly true that the events recorded in the Old and New Testaments and

¹ Eph. iii. 9, 10, "the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be made known by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God." Col. i. 13-18. "His dear Son, in whom we have redemption through His blood, even the remission of sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature. For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him. And He is before all things and by Him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the Church."

² By a spiritual being I mean one who is capable of conscious relations with God. It is an accident of such a being to be or not to be bound by special spatial relations as we now are: and we do not know whether any others are thus bound, and if so, whether exactly as we are. There may be, for all we know, an endless variety of such relations between a material world and its "inhabitants."

the writings concerning them belong to this planet. But it would be unscientific and unphilosophical to make certain that for any inhabitants of any other planets, in our own system or any other, these events are as if they had never been. The manifold wisdom of God is not so tied down. Not so rashly would any one a hundred years ago have scouted the idea of our present knowledge of contemporaneous events in America or of our telegraphing pictures from Paris. And if we cannot even guess what may not lie in the power of ourselves, poor planetary creatures as we are, how can we presume to limit the resources of God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth? St. Peter¹ thinks it worth while to tell us that God is independent of Time as we know it; but as regards Space, so far below Time in realness, no one has told us this, because we can see it for ourselves.

I am not maintaining that there are spiritual inhabitants of other portions of our world of space, nor that, if there are such, they have, while in this our world, knowledge of any aspects of the mystery of the crucifixion. Nobody knows. I am only concerned to deny certain rash and *borné* suppositions on which Christianity is sometimes belittled as planetary. Such pseudo-reasoning is arguing the wrong way round—from the unknown to the known. What little we do know² or seem to know, is in the other direction; that by the Church, which is the Body

¹ 2 Pet. iii. 8.

² See notes on p. 59.

of the incarnate, crucified, risen, and ascended Son of God, is to be made known unto all Creation the manifold wisdom of God. So ours is a planetary part or aspect of a cosmical religion : a religion in which the Cross holds an essential place.

VI

THE UNITY OF GOD

So far we have been concerned with the pain of the created universe. Can we dare to look beyond Creation to the Creator? We are told that there is joy, not only of the angels, but in the presence of the angels, over one sinner that repenteth.¹ Can we help asking whether there is anything in any wise akin to sorrow over the unrepentant? The anger and wrath of God we read of in plain words, everywhere: and we realize that a capacity for righteous anger is involved in true love. Is there in God anything in any wise corresponding to the pain of the Cross and Passion?

Many people would say, No; pain only belongs to multiform and complex and imperfectly unified and therefore jarring human nature. God is perfectly simple, and therefore purely happy without alloy of pain.

But if we asked what they mean by perfect simplicity, we should find it to be the simplicity of the atom; not of God.

Every one recognizes, with Hume,² that the

¹ Luke xv. 10.

² "Tis evident that existence in itself belongs only to unity, and is never applicable to number, but on account of the unites,

one is the real, and that this is why we are interested in it.

But what is unity?

One, we shall all agree, is not a part, but a whole. One is not two or three, but only one; that is, it is indivisible.

In what direction are we to look for such, and by what method shall we find it? By analysis and abstraction or by division, says the plain man of British race. One stone, *e.g.*, is obviously not such; because it is part of a rock, and it can be broken up into more stones. Go on breaking it up until you can go no further, and you will have found the one. So we go on; and the further we go, the poorer our one becomes, until at last it has shed its weight, its colour, its size, its shape, and the only attribute it retains is that which is connoted by its name Atom: it cannot be divided any further. And even so, it is only a creature of the imagination, or a necessary presupposition for building up certain theories of the material universe, or certain materialistic philosophies.¹ No man has ever seen or handled an atom, nor ever could. And as I understand, the physicist's atom, after

of which the number is compos'd. Twenty men may be said to exist; but 'tis only because one, two, three, four, etc., are existent, and if you deny the existence of the latter, that of the former falls of course. . . . The unity which can exist alone and whose existence is necessary to that of all number . . . must be perfectly indivisible, and incapable of being resolved into any lesser unity" (Hume, ed. Green and Grose, vol. ii. p. 337).

¹ νόμος γλυκὺν, νόμος πικρὸν, νόμος θερμὸν, νόμος ψυχρὸν, νόμος χροίη, ἐτεῖ δὲ ἄτομα καὶ κενόν.—Democritus.

passing through some years of trial as a revived vortex—a movement of nothing which by moving becomes something—was found to be after all not indivisible, but a whole system of spinning electrons, each of which, if indivisible, is so because it is a centre of movement.

There let us leave it, and turn right round to another direction and with another method; in the direction of spirit, and with the method of synthesis.

Plainly you cannot get to indivisibility in inanimate matter until you have lost all that might make unity worth having—if then. Let us go a step up the scale.

(1) In a plant there is some unity. One plant is not a part of another plant: nor can it be divided at random. And what makes it to a certain extent whole and indivisible is (*a*) that it does not, like the stone, consist only of its visible material particles whose essence it is to be outside one another, but it has the elusive immaterial property or quality called Life, a life which runs through all its parts; (*b*) that it is not homogeneous like the bit of stone, but has differing parts which help one another. It is a polity of cell-tissues with a consensus of functions.

(2) In an animal's body there is a closer and richer bond of unity just because it is more complex, the parts being more highly differentiated, and the various cell-tissues more dependent on the life of the animal as a whole. Most plants can be divided by proper processes, and parts of any plant will live and grow

for a certain time when severed. But if a mouse's foot (*e.g.*) is cut off, it cannot take up its proper nourishment, and all its cells are soon dead.

(3) A mouse's mind is much less divisible than its body. Its foot, when cut off, although no longer able to function as a foot, yet exists and can be shown as a bit of matter. But take from the mouse any of its mental faculties—*e.g.* memory—and it has simply vanished.

(4) Our mind, obviously, has far more coherence than a mouse's. If we lose our memory, we recognize and lament the loss. We not only have a consensus of mental functions, but we also know them as our own, and consciously set to work to cultivate and control them. And we distinguish very clearly between ourself and our surroundings, while yet the surroundings would not be *my* surroundings at all if they only lay outside me as one stone lies outside another, and were not—whatever else they may be—within my consciousness in me and for me. Also I know myself as one self among many selves, quite distinct from every other, and yet constituted what I individually am as a nexus of relations with these other selves, my ancestors and contemporaries, with their doings and their relations to each other in the setting of time and space. All these most complicated things come to a focus in me ; and I know it. And not only are things and persons within my mind ; but also I attain my true unity within myself through acting on the things and giving myself out to the persons. Knowledge which I give out to others

F

is not taken from me but secured to me and enriched in and for me.

And this spiritual unity, although easier to speak of in terms of knowledge, is really stronger on the side of will and of feeling. The strongest exercise of my will is to submit it to the will of another. It is in giving myself to others in love that I find and realize my true self, the human self made in the image of God, Who is Love. My heart is not like a cake, which you cannot both eat and have, and which, divided amongst more, each has less of: but the more true love I give out to one, the more I have for others, and the richer I myself become.

A spiritual unit, we see, is not, like matter, exclusive, but inclusive; and the simpler and saner the character, the more so.

Yet—partly, no doubt, because our body, which essentially is the organ of our spirit, is accidentally or transiently connected with matter—our unity is sadly imperfect. Sometimes we are of two minds. Sometimes we are (as we say) torn with conflicting emotions. Sometimes our reason and our feelings are at variance, or what we will we can hardly perform, because it is against our liking. Even the sanest of us in body and soul are sorely broken in our unity of feeling, thinking, and willing.

(5) One step further, to the Unity of God. That is the only perfect unity, which never is or can be broken or flawed. "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do."¹ "The Spirit searcheth all things,

¹ John v. 19.

yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God."¹ So we have learned to speak of the Holy and Undivided (*i.e.* indivisible) Trinity, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."² God perfectly knows Himself and loves Himself in His inner differentiation of what we in our "dialect"³ call three Persons; and the will of the Blessed Three is perfectly one.

Thus the Christian revelation confirms and illuminates and crowns what Western philosophy, under Christian influence, has been learning through the centuries. The man, polishing the old shield to see what it was made of, has at last seen himself in it. And what he has found in himself, he has bit by bit guessed of his Maker. The One, which began in early Greek thought as some simple material stuff, has step by step been seen to be Spirit, of which the essence is self-consciousness. A thinker implies thought and a thing thought of.⁴

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

² Jas. i. 17.

³ Westcott, *Heb.* p. lviii.

⁴ "But what is Spirit? It is the one immutably homogeneous Infinite—pure Identity—which in its second phase separates itself from itself and makes this second aspect its own polar opposite, viz., as existence for-and-in-self as contrasted with the Universal . . . But this separation is annulled . . . if Spirit be defined as absolute reflection within itself . . . it is recognized as Triune; the Father and the Son, and that duality which essentially characterizes it as Spirit."—*Hegel, Phil. of History, Bohn's Tr.*, p. 235. "For knowledge we require another thing that is known: and which, when knowledge knows it, is thereby appropriated. It is implied in this that God—the eternal and

There needs in modern metaphysics but one step further: the reasoned working out of the truth which St. John has taught us from the beginning, that God is Love.¹

Here is the verification of metaphysics from Practice.² The simple believer lives in Christ and Christ in him; so and so only he brings forth much fruit; he lives, that is, in Love, and finds Love living in him.

For God is the One by Whom and in Whom and for Whom all the Many of creation consist. And it is the movement of love within the inner Being of God that has carried Him to make, out of His own substance, creatures which yet are in some quite true sense not Himself but other: even creatures which, like ourselves, not only condition or limit God's working, but can actually thwart it—for the moment. (Perhaps somewhat as we men detach a portion of our consciousness for such and such a purpose, and it goes on its way with a quasi-independence.)

What good theologians mean by the Simplicity³ of God may be akin to what is meant by

self-subsistent—eternally begets Himself as His Son—distinguishes Himself from Himself. But what He thus distinguishes from Himself, has not the form of an otherness; but what is distinguished is *ipso facto* = that with what it is parted from. God is Spirit: no colouring or mixture enters this pure light."—*Logic, Bohn's Tr.*, p. 397.

¹ M. Bergson and his allies seem to be beginning this working out, in their exposition of the inadequacy of thought and their bringing out of the value of instinct or intuition.

² Our Christian Pragmatism does not scoff at and reject metaphysics, but thanks God for its corroboration.

³ St. Thomas Aquinas used the term to express the truth that God is "*actus purus*,"

saying that Christ is entire in every particle of the consecrated elements. They certainly do not mean that we ought to conceive of God as of a sort of spiritual *ὑλη*, a stream of tendency, whether of life or of righteousness or what not, into which we highly organized beings can dip at pleasure and get what we want. If the One were such as that, it would not be worth having; for it would not be so good as ourselves, and there would be really no God. They mean that the whole of what God is goes to making the smallest creature or action of a creature such as it is.¹ Nothing goes on in independence of God. He is intimately present, both as immanent and as transcendent, to every part and process of the created universe.

The most complete master of fencing is the one whose whole self can be most completely at the end of his foil. The ablest statesman or general is the one who can be dictating different despatches at the same time, giving his mind wholly to each in successive moments. And what we, in proportion to our degree of unity or concentration, can more or less do in succession, God can do simultaneously and to an infinite extent.

Again, it is a commonplace of psychology that, at the same moment, our consciousness is manifold and of many degrees. We walk and breathe and look about us and listen to the birds, and have hardly the less attention to spare for the

¹ "Little flower, but if I could understand
What you are, root and all and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

friend to whom we are talking. Yet the individual whole which we are, and as at that time influenced by our surroundings, gives a special character to each thing we are doing. The very curve which our foot makes in our walking differs from any one else's curve, and is affected by what we are talking about. Our individual unity is constituted by and works out in innumerable and multiform particulars of perception and action.

Then, as we, with our imperfect and feeble minds, have, at any given time, many modes and degrees of consciousness corresponding to our own inner mind and to the multiplicity of our immediate surroundings, so must God have, only that His are infinite in number, kind, and degree; and that His are completely unified, even the most insignificant of them being known and done in relation to the infinite whole. For all that exists is present to His consciousness. As (*e.g.*) the pen of a writer moves, God is present to its movement in several roughly distinguishable modes:—to the physical action on pencil and paper, and to the appearance of the writing; to the physiological processes in brain and hand and arm, of which the writer is unconscious; to the sense of what is written, as it is in His sight; to the writer's thoughts and efforts as he writes, as these are in His sight. And He is present to all these things also as and so far as the writer knows them, through His knowledge of all thoughts from the inside of the mind in which He is present, thinking through the man's thoughts, willing through his will, feeling through his

heart, so far as he does not hinder Him by pride and sloth, the only things in him which are his and not God's.

And so through all creation, from the amœba to the archangel. The wounded sparrow, the mown lily, even the hairs of our head, are intimately known to God, and not only known, but cared for; every living thing according to its capacity known and sympathized with and succoured as from within, immanently: and likewise transcendently; *i.e.*, not as they seem to themselves, but as God sees them in the light of His universal purposes.

Now, if this is so, can it be that God, who is indeed, Life, which is Power and Will, and Light, which is Knowledge and Wisdom, but who above all is Holy and Righteous Love, including Light and Life and leading them—can it be that He has no modes of consciousness at all analogous to the pain of the wounded sparrow, so that He can sympathize, as we do, with something of a real fellow-feeling? Surely that is so paradoxical a position that it never would have entered any one's head except in obedience to a stiff and abstract logic arguing from certain supposed perfections of the Deity: perfections which left but little room for what we know and reverence as Love. God has no passions; God has no imperfections: therefore God can have no pain or sorrow. How do we know that? Not by natural reasoning. Reasoning, as we ought to do, from lowest to low, from low to high, from high to higher, from higher to Highest, God should have an infinite

capacity for pain. For in this capacity, quite as much as in any other, does brute exceed plant, and man brute, and most finely organized and most highly moral man ordinary man. The evidence for this is physiological as well as that of common observation : and we are on quite certain ground in holding that the highest races of men and the highest individuals have this capacity in the highest degree. That is to say, it is not an imperfection, but a perfection. We see the direction of the curve as it goes above out of sight.

But again, God, it may be said, even if He had the capacity, has no occasion for pain, because He is Almighty and has made the world according to His own will. How about sin, then, which can be defined as that which is contrary to the will of God ? Might not God, having the capacity, also purposely have made the occasion ?

VII

THE ETERNAL IN THE TEMPORAL

LET us try now to work towards the same point from the side of history, endeavouring to see something of the eternal significance of the Cross.

The Crucifixion, then, took place, as all other human events have taken place, at a certain spot, and on a certain day of a certain year; it was a fact of history. Yet it is surely impossible not to see that it had and has its eternal side.

Even with us human beings, there is a quasi-eternity in any great event.¹

“ Ah, did you once see Shelley plain,
And did he stop and speak to you,
And did you speak to him again?
How strange it seems and new.
But you were living before that,
And also you are living after.”

And so Tennyson felt :

“ Likewise the imaginative woe
That loved to handle spiritual strife
Diffused the shock through all my life
But in the present broke the blow.”

In anticipation it is the same: we are fairly

¹ Browning, “ Memorabilia.”

staggered when we come up to some great moment which we have long been looking forward to. Surely it cannot be this very day, this one only day! And this recoil, this refusal to accept the thing as a bare momentary fact, to-day not taken place, to-morrow over, is very far from an illusion. The thing has been taken up with our own timeless personality, and in a very true sense partakes of our eternity. Unless there has been that within us which so corresponded with the outer event as to make it a fact for us, the thing would have been for us non-existent.

And even the most insignificant event or thing may be viewed, as Spinoza showed, *sub quadam specie æternitatis*, in its relation to God.

So, then, and much more, must this be true of the Cross and Passion of Jesus Christ our Divine Redeemer. Though we do not in the least know how, the fact wrought outwardly in this world of time and space must surely have some counterpart in the Eternal Mind and Heart of Love. And in this counterpart must there not be something in some wise analogous to pain?

In our Lord's risen Body there were the marks of the nails and spear:¹ and "in the midst of the throne . . . stood a Lamb as it had been slain."² Alive, indeed, for evermore, and triumphant: yet not without mysterious marks of the bruised heel.

And of the members of His Mystical body He says, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the

¹ John xx. 27.

² Rev. v. 6.

least of these, ye did it not to Me."¹ "Why persecutest thou Me?"² And on the other hand His Apostles rejoice to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ."³

"That Christ has a heavenly body of His own, apart from other men, we cannot doubt—in which He is manifested to celestial beings. It may, however, be possible to separate too sharply between that Body (sometimes, erroneously, called His natural Body) and the Church which is His Mystical Body."⁴ And He undoubtedly suffers in His mystical Body.

But it is not so much by the consideration of scattered hints that we shall advance, as by dealing seriously with the idea of Revelation and Manifestation. The Word became flesh not only to fulfil all human righteousness on our behalf, but also to unveil and manifest to us men the eternal counsel and will and heart of God. This He did, partly by His teaching, but much more by His life. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."⁵ The very purpose of it was, "That they may know Thee the only true God."⁶ And the essence of the matter of the new revelation was that God is Love; Love including Light and Life. The Jews knew that God was a Righteous God: but now the veil was done away, and in the face of Jesus Christ it was seen that God was Love.

Love, as we know it, means self-sacrifice. So

¹ Matt. xxv. 45. ² Acts ix. 4; cf. Isa. lxiii. 9; Eph. iv. 30.

³ Col. i. 24. ⁴ Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, chap. viii., § 9.

⁵ John xiv. 9. ⁶ John xvii. 3.

did it mean to the Incarnate Son. It is conceivable that He might have lived a peaceful beneficent life, "doing good," indeed, on a far larger scale than He did, and then gone back happily to heaven. But He suffered all His life, and He died by the worst of deaths. That was the form of the manifestation of God, Who is Love.

And the manifestation was as full and complete as man would ever be capable of receiving: it was final. God had at sundry times and in divers manners spoken to men¹ by the prophets, but now in One Who is Son. The manifestation, then, is absolutely trustworthy. Jesus Christ is the Truth.

Now we Westerns are always inclined to think of the visible things and acts as the realities, and of their invisible spiritual counterparts or antitypes as their shadows or reflections or copies.² When Christ says, I am the Way, the Vine, the Door, the Shepherd, we dismiss the expression as "metaphorical": that is to say, we think He meant that in some aspects or functions He is like the way, vines, doors, etc., of our ordinary life. So with His parables. But the converse is the truth. As Dr. Westcott says on John xv. 1, "the natural vine only imperfectly realizes the idea which it expresses. . . . Christ is the ideal vine" (*ἡ ἀληθινή*). The ideal is the real. So is He the real door, and our common

¹ Or *in*, Heb. i. 1.

² This is the root error of anthropomorphism, as though God were made in the image of man.

visible doors teach us a little of what He ideally and truly, *i.e.* really is as considered in this aspect. So our shepherds are a little like what He truly and completely is as our Good Shepherd. It is the things which are not seen, and, above all, it is Christ Himself and God Himself that are the realities, and the things and acts which have their place in time and space that are the pictures or shadows.

This is the ground taken by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The heavenly things are the real ones. The law had a shadow of them: the New Covenant has much more, for it has a picture or image¹ (εἰκὼν); but even the εἰκὼν has not an independent value; it is the εἰκὼν of the eternal realities. Means it is indeed through which truth and grace are brought us; but its value lies in the heavenly truth and grace flowing from the invisible Christ. The High Priest's intercession was the shadow; the Christian priest's sacramental intercession is the very image of Christ's intercession in heaven, even as Christ Himself is the image² of the Father; but just so,³ it is Christ's intercession in heaven⁴ which gives it all its power. Dr. Westcott says: "It is assumed throughout the Epistle that all visible theocratic institutions answer to a divine antitype (archetype). They are (so to

¹ Heb. x. 1.

² 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15.

³ John v. 19.

⁴ By "in heaven," here and elsewhere, I mean whatever the *Our Father* means by it. "In the heavenly sphere," as Dr. A. J. Robinson says on Eph. i. 2, is a good way of putting it in modern language.

speak), a translation into a particular dialect of eternal truths: a representation under special conditions of an absolute ideal.

"In some sense, which we can feel rather than define, the eternal is declared to lie beneath the temporal (xii. 27). . . . We see the reality but only in figures (*e.g.* Apoc. xxi. 16). Judaism was the shadow, and Christianity is the substance; yet both are regarded under the conditions of earth. But the figures have an abiding significance. There is a heavenly city in the spiritual world, an organized body of rational beings; "a congregation" (ἐκκλησία) which answers to the full enjoyment of the privileges of social life: xi. 10 (ἡ τοὺς θεμ. ἔχ. πόλις): xi. 16; xii. 22f. (comp. viii. 11; xiii. 14; and additional note on xi. 10). There is also a heavenly sanctuary there, which was the pattern of the earthly, to confirm the eternal duty and joy of worship: viii. 2, 5."¹

Much more have all the acts and facts of our Lord's own earthly life "an abiding significance." St. John, indeed, makes this so plain as to give some modern critics occasion to maintain that he (or rather, whoever wrote the Fourth Gospel) does not even intend us to take the facts as facts. According to them this Gospel² is "truth embodied in a tale," like the early stories of Genesis. The writer (*e.g.*) did not intend us to believe that Mary and John in fact stood by the cross of

¹ *Epistle to the Hebrews. Introd.* lviii., lix.

² M. Loisy has also, with much less plausibility, applied this method to the Synoptics in regard to lesser details; and his followers or successors have thus used it so indiscriminately as to make the whole Gospel story a myth,

Jesus, but put them into the story to symbolize certain principles. And so with more important facts. Now this seems a nemesis, due to our ordinary neglect of the eternal significance of the facts and our shutting our eyes to St. John's teaching through them. There is no need to throw away the facts in order to hold to their significance. It is because the facts are facts that they have their significance. God's words are deeds.¹ And, conversely, God's deeds are words, fraught with infinite and eternal meaning. And most of all the Cross and Passion.

Christ "through an eternal spirit² offered Himself spotless to God." "The apparent purpose [the epithet *eternal*] is meant to serve is, to explain how it comes that the sacrifice of Christ has perpetual validity, how it obtained *eternal* redemption. . . . The spirit which found expression in Christ's self-sacrifice, [whether His own Spirit, the seat of His Divine Personality, or, according to other authorities, the Holy Ghost,] is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, and in its eternal self-identity lends to the priestly deed imperishable merit and significance. . . . For an eternal spirit is independent of time and gives to acts done through its inspiration validity for all time. . . . A sacrifice offered

¹ "Geschrieben steht : ' Im Anfang war das Wort.'

Hier stock' ich schon !

. . . Im Anfang war der Sinn.

. . . Im Anfang war die Kraft

. . . Auf Einmal seh' ich Rath,

Und schreib getrost : im Anfang war die That."

Faust, i,

² διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. Heb. ix. 14.

through the Spirit is a *reality*, not a mere shadowy symbol, and the spiritually real belongs to the heavenlies even though it have its place also as an historic event among the earthlies. . . . Through this *eternal* spirit Christ offered Himself before He came into the world, when He was in the world, after He left the world. . . . The term 'eternal' lifts that offering above all limiting conditions of space and time."¹

So all the history of God's dealings with us men, wrought out, as they must needs be for our apprehension, under conditions of time and space, speaks to us of the eternal mind and purpose and heart of God. Little indeed it tells us, even of what concerns humanity; and almost nothing of what is "cosmical" as opposed to "planetary." And that little is dim, seen as in a glass darkly, as "in a riddle."²

Yet we do know "in part." God made the world because it pleased Him to do so.³ And "before the foundation of the world"⁴ Christ was "foreknown." This was "the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly *places* might be known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."⁵

And it is well-nigh impossible to suppose that God, in creating the world, did not "foreknow"

¹ Bruce, *Ep. to the Hebrews*, p. 339, ff.

² 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

³ Jas. i. 18.

⁴ 1 Pet. i. 19, 20.

⁵ Eph. iii. 9-12, R.V.

the Fall, which would make redemption necessary. It is not needful to hold that God planned or intended the Fall. Indeed, nothing is more striking in the Bible than the repeated declarations of God that He holds Himself in no sense whatever responsible for sin. Sin is what is flatly contrary to His will ; however little we may be able to understand how this can be. But God, knowing what His act of creation would involve ; what it would cost man and what it would cost Himself, yet took upon Himself the responsibility for creating men who were capable of sin. In spite of this liability (or even, for aught we know, partly because of it—for we really know nothing about these things) it was good for man to exist : and so, out of love, God created him at the cost of the suffering life and death of His Son. And the Son,¹ through Whom and for Whom the world was made,² “grudged existence to nothing,” as St. Athanasius says, whatever their existence might cost Him.

We must remember that when we speak of God’s “foreknowledge,” we are speaking, as Westcott would say, in our own dialect.³ We do not know that, to the inner mind of the Eternal, the Creation was before the Incarnation, or the Ascension after the Crucifixion.⁴ It is of course open to any one to hold that it was so ; and M. Bergson’s is a very strong advocacy for giving to time more reality than perhaps most theologians—certainly than most metaphysicians

¹ Heb. i. 2.

² Col. i. 16. But cf. Heb. ii. 10.

³ *Supra*, p. 78.

⁴ See additional note at end of chapter.

have been used to giving to it. But it is not possible to teach *dogmatically* that, "since" the Incarnation and Ascension, the inner Being of the Ever Blessed Trinity is in any way changed from what it was "before." Rather, the events of Creation, the Incarnation, the Cross, the Ascension, would seem to be what we can apprehend, in terms of time, of attributes or relations or modes of existence which, in and for God in Himself, are timeless. We are compelled, indeed, to speak of these as once future, and now past; and so in human history they are: but when we say (*e.g.*) that Christ has united our nature to Himself and taken it into heaven, the most we can venture to assert of God in regard to this is that the Incarnation and Ascension, being an event to us and the angels, is in some sense an event to Him. There must be some sense in which God, having created a world in space and living creatures in space and time—or rather, in whom are time and space—is cognizant, through or in relation to those creatures, of their temporal and spatial conditions. We might perhaps say that God, as living and dwelling in and with His creatures, has modes of consciousness for which things in some wise take place, as for the creatures themselves.¹

So the Cross and Passion would be an event (1) for Christ in His human life, and so for the Father; (2) for us men, and so for the Father. And it would reveal and manifest an eternal or timeless capacity in God for something like what we know as pain; this capacity existing and

¹ See pp. 70, 71.

being exercised, so far as we know, only in relation to creatures.

That is to say that when a creature suffers or sins, there is some quite true sense in which that sin or suffering may be said to grieve God, just as a sinner's repentance may be said to give God joy.

One would think that only in this quasi-secondary way can God have "occasion" for anything like suffering. As we are taught, the joy of the Three Blessed Persons in the unity of the Trinity must be perfect. There can be nothing to mar or hinder the joy of the outgoing of mutual love which is the life of the Ever Blessed One. The limits or differences within His Being only cause and, as it were, catch and reflect the joy. The Son, being "the limit of the Father,"¹ is at the same time the Infinite measure of the Infinite Father: the Father is not straitened in Him.

But in God's love of His creature man, we know only too well what checks, what rebuffs, what insults we can oppose. Nothing but the Cross could make us believe it possible that God can love such as we are: and we continually doubt and ignore and even despair of His love because we cannot see how we can be anything but hateful to Him. Yet we are sure, because of the Cross, that it must be true: He must love us. Then, when we think of the pain which even to ourselves "being evil" there is in our love of one who is or has been pre-eminently "a

¹ St. Irenæus.

sinner," we can see a little of what it may cost God to keep expending His love on us.

It may be that there is this element of what we call *pain* in God's love of all His creatures, sinful or sinless, through the self-limitation involved therein ; that there is always and necessarily pain in the meeting of the infinite and the finite ; and that this is what made (or makes) creation to be, as we are taught, an act or working of love. So philosophical mystics or mystical philosophers, such as Jacob Boehme,¹ have felt.

Again, it may be that one purpose of the Incarnation was (or is) the acquiring by the Divine Being or the extending of the Divine Life to a mode of existence in which pain, either from contact with sin or from simple limitation, might be experienced. That is to say that the Incarnation is involved in the Creation : that it " became " God in bringing into being creatures with a consciousness in some very real sense distinct from His consciousness, a consciousness which they know as their own, to take upon Himself a consciousness corresponding to theirs : to go out from His innermost Being and differentiate Himself, while yet remaining—if possible, all the more—One in Himself. It was through the Son that the worlds were made. It may be, that is to say, that without creation there would not only have been (or be) no occasion of pain (I speak in our " dialect "), but also no capacity for pain : that the same force of love which made the world produced or educed or educes the Incarnation with its capacity for the pain of the

¹ See Appendix, note F.

Atonement. And it may be that the root error of Patripassianism is in the not making this distinction between God as He is in Himself and God as Creator. And perhaps the opinion that pain, being a passion, is unworthy of God, needs the same distinction; for it is a commonplace of theology that, in creating, God adds nothing to His own intrinsic perfection of being.

But in truth, the same capacity or experience which in one setting is an imperfection may in another be a perfection. It is his imperfection which makes an imbecile enjoy some babyish pastime: it is a perfection in his teacher to be able to enjoy it with him. So it is with all the condescending sympathy of love. And it is only the strongest minds and wills that can know what to be ignorant of and can be so. So it was with our Lord in his voluntary limitations of knowledge and of power. He had rightful power over these just as He had rightful power to lay down His life. And likewise He had power to break up His serenity and "trouble Himself"¹ to weeping, in sympathy with his friends' sorrow. To sorrow and suffer can be an imperfection only as is the whole of that *κένωσις* which to us Christians is the crowning proof of the perfection of Divine Love, working, as we know it is love's essence to work, in self-sacrifice.

All these are guesses, more or less hazardous, at what may be partial explanations or ways of conceiving a truth which does not stand or fall with them: that "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea, for ever."² He is still

¹ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν, John xi. 33.

² Heb. xiii. 8.

Love. And love means sympathy, not mere pity, but feeling with the beloved. "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities."¹ And this is what every simple Christian heart requires. The martyrs of all times and climes have been sustained by the belief that Jesus was feeling for them. And so with every lonely sufferer. And on the other hand, as non-Christian moralists see clearly, the Christian horror of sin comes from what they call "the conception of a suffering God." It is an ineradicable motive in every Christian's practical daily life, so to walk as to please God, so to act as not to grieve the Holy Spirit. When we have done wrong we are sorry, not only because for that sin Christ was once crucified,² but because we have grieved Him Who is ever present with us and in us, loving us better than we love ourselves.³

So the common Christian consciousness bears

¹ Heb. iv. 15.

² See Heb. vi. 6.

³ As these sheets are going through the press, a friend has caused me to read a very interesting article, "The Cross," by the Rev. G. A. Johnston Ross, in the *Hibbert Journal* of April, 1911. The writer is concerned to "harmonise . . . the historical and the timeless in religion," especially in regard to the Cross. The Cross, he says, "appears as the projection upon time's plane of the eternal state of things at the Divine Heart. That is equivalent to saying that when man sins God suffers: it means that a whole system of theology lies in the appeal, 'Grieve not the Holy Ghost.' It means that if the present grief of God over sin could be expressed in terms of human life, it must be, it has been, expressed in the pouring out of bloody sweat, and of a pure soul unto death."

out and corroborates the conclusion towards which we have seen several independent lines of reasoning converge. Each one alone may be precarious; but their evidence is more than cumulative, (and it has been rightly observed that most minds do not adequately appreciate the value of cumulative evidence).

Psychologically we have seen that there is an element of pain in our highest joys, whether from the twist and defect of a sinful nature, or more probably from the mere sense of limitation of a finite being in relation with the infinite. Also that the higher a creature, the greater and more subtle is its capacity for pain.

Morally we have seen not only the educational good of pain, but also its abiding value as an element in self-sacrificing love: the love transfiguring the pain, so that it is submerged in the lover's joy. As we pass from low to high, from high to highest in the scale of creation, we find the balance change from the unwilling sacrifice of lower for higher to the willing, loving, spiritual sacrifice of higher for lower.

Historically and metaphysically we have seen that, while every event may be said to have an eternal aspect, it may reasonably be held that the eternal aspect of the Incarnation and the Cross and Passion is their main aspect, revealing to us the Eternal mind and working of God, Who is Love.

And we have seen that since God's modes of consciousness must be infinite, more than corresponding to the potential infinity of Creation, so, whether through the Humanity of the

Son or otherwise, there is room for Him to feel something analogous to pain without either taking from or adding to or in any way affecting the pure and perfect joy of His inner Blessedness.

And all these lines have converged to uphold the practical conviction on which the daily life of the millions of good Christians is based. They hate and fight against sin, because it grieves God Who loves them and Whom they love.

So, although we cannot in the deepest sense claim for Pain a place with Law, in the bosom of God,¹ we do claim for it a place in the hands and feet and heart of the Son of God made Man. And nothing which the Son does or experiences is apart from or unshared by the Holy Ghost or by the Father, the primal Fount of all love.

But as, even for us feeble and selfish creatures, love can so transfigure pain as to turn it into the moment of an exceeding joy ; so, only incomprehensibly more, must it be with whatever that is like to our pain God condescends to take upon Himself in His love for us His children. It can only be an element or moment in an immeasurable joy.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO PAGE 81.

TWO DIFFICULTIES.

There are two difficulties which are seldom mentioned, perhaps because there is so little to be said about them. But it

¹ Hooker, *E. P.*, Bk. I. xvi., § 8.

seems worth trying to say that little, because often a doubt which lies quite far back in our mind hinders our practical energy more than we are aware of ; and sometimes the mere explicit statement of it, even with no hint of any resolution, is healthier than the dim unexplored corner of doubt.

I. The first of these is the relation of our Lord's Incarnate life to His life in heaven with all its cosmical relations. He was both Almighty, All-knowing God, and also helpless Babe: a difficulty indeed.

It is impossible to suppose that these cosmical relations were in abeyance while the Son was a helpless Infant. And we have learned that Mary's little Child really was and did not only feign to be growing in wisdom as well as stature: that He really did not know and could not do things which He did know and do in His later life ; and that all through His earthly life His knowledge and power were really limited by the strong deliberate purpose of His condescending love. That is to say that, *qua* helpless Infant in the manger, He was not "bearing along all things by the word of His power."¹ This first solution is discredited.

Another and opposite attempt at a solution seems to be filtering into current modes of thought: that the Incarnation was—if one may so speak—partial. Whatever and so much of the Godhead of the Son as could take Flesh did so take it. But His Incarnation was only the fullest manifestation possible under human conditions of a Personality which was all the time in all its fulness in heaven just as before the Incarnation. This view would find support in what some authorities read in John iii. 13, "even the Son of man, which is in heaven." This is, in the main, the position so nobly and reverently argued by Dr. Weston in *The One Christ*: and it has been and is held by many theologians as catholic and devout as he. In their hands it is, of course, perfectly safe.² Yet when this view is popularized and expounded by any one who is not both a devout believer and a trained theologian, it seems to be peculiarly open to mishandling ; to the making Christ's one of many Incarnations, unique only by reason of its fulness ; fulness in so great a degree indeed as to make it somewhat different in kind, but yet not the stupendous fact it is to us Catholics.

¹ Heb. i. 3, R.V.

² See Dr. Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern*.

Is not this difficulty based on the anthropomorphic assumption of a series of events in heaven running parallel with those on earth? And may it not, perhaps, be solved by being transcended, challenging this assumption?

May it not be that those momentous thirty-three years were in reality no sort of break in the Eternal life of God? May it not be that to us only do they appear as an event in time; but that to God, to Whom a thousand years are as one day, they were not even as the time of the twinkling of an eye, but correlated with His own inner life as other events in the world's history are correlated: being temporal to us, but eternal to Him in His inner Being, and though in some sense temporal to Him too, yet only so as He is in His relation to His creation. The manner of such correlation, indeed, must altogether pass our understanding, but yet it is not so unintelligible that we cannot see the possibility of the fact. We may believe the *that*, although we cannot guess at the *what*.

According to a solution reached along these lines, the Son might be thought of as wholly Incarnate in the Man and in the Infant Jesus, in an absolutely unique manner. Yet it would be true that the Infant was really weak and helpless and ignorant as are other human infants. In His own inner Being, the Son might be thought of as wholly in heaven without the smallest break or disruption or dislocation being caused by the Incarnation which took place on a different plane, one of the many planes of God's consciousness as Creator and Sustainer and Redeemer of a world whose creatures' consciousness was in terms of succession and duration.

As Dr. Du Bose rightly contends, any process should be judged in the light of its consummation. And so, I would urge, should the Divine Infancy be regarded by the light of its consummation, the Son eternally Human at the Father's right hand. And by eternity I understand at least independence of succession and duration, in such sense that the Son is not *necessarily* to be thought of as more Human "now" than He was (or rather *is*) before the foundation of the world.¹

Our Lord's human life and death and ascension did in very deed lift us up to heaven. It was *the* event in the world's history. And yet it may be that in a still deeper sense it was a manifestation of what He eternally is.²

¹ John viii. 58.

² See p. 81.

I do not, of course, imagine that the foregoing considerations constitute a solution, or even bring appreciably nearer any solution of a problem which, doubtless, is in its nature insoluble so long as we are in this world. But a good deal is gained in such cases by seeing any mistake in our way of approaching the problem.

II. The other difficulty I can do little more than state. It is this. We pray to God that His Kingdom may come; and we work for it. And yet are we to conceive of His Kingdom as aeonially increasing in extension and intension; or is the process that of a closed cycle?

If the latter, those among us who live in sight of large views would feel their zeal damped. We may take our cycle as large as we please and as complicated as any Buddhist can imagine; and yet that does not satisfy us. If the former, God's good would seem to be, like our own, not perfect and timeless, but realized in endless progress and growth. This, again, hardly fits in with what we hold to be true concerning God's perfection.

It may possibly be that, God being in Himself absolutely perfect, capable of no further good, yet His Kingdom, Creation, as M. Bergson holds, is really growing. This would rather seem to fit in with the theological distinction between God's intrinsic and extrinsic glory.

Either way, Hegel has shown us how not to be afraid of such a dilemma.

The best way of dealing with this difficulty seems to be one the very opposite of transcending; namely, humbly to creep beneath and between its inverted horns; as indeed we commonly do. We do know that God's writ does not run here and now in our world as it does in heaven. We do not love Him as the saints and angels love Him. And so we may leave speculating and address ourselves to our local and temporal conditions, working while it is day.

It is not strange to find apparently insoluble difficulties in things so high, when even with so familiar and comparatively simple a thing as perceptible space, it is equally impossible to imagine it either endless or not endless. Yet we do not on this account give up phenomenal space as an illusion.

VIII

CONCLUSION

WHAT shall we say then to these things? As wisdom is justified of her children, does the Bible and does our reason justify pain in God's universe? Or must we think of it as an illusion, or a mistake, or a mere valueless consequence of error or sin, to be entirely done away by a clearer knowledge and a truer life? I think it is abundantly clear that, according to Revelation and also to reason, pain has its value right through life, from almost the lowest to the highest. It is that through which evil is turned into good; and when there is no evil, it is an element or moment in the passage to a higher good. And its eternal place, where on both sides it is felt, is the meeting-point between the infinite and the finite.

It is connected, indeed, rather with Becoming than with Being; it is, at any level, of the essence of the joy of Becoming: that is why St. Paul, the strenuous worker and sufferer, and the philosopher of the manifold world and its doings and sufferings, tells us more about it than St. John. St. John, on the other hand, with his metaphysical mind, in his steady white heat of love, in his high contemplation of the Eternal

Being of God, seeks to interpret for us, as man may, from the point of view of heaven, the events of the life of God made Flesh, from the Incarnation to the Descent of the Spirit : and so shows us, dimly indeed, something of what the Passion may be to God.

Pain is connected with our becoming after the likeness of God in whose image we were created ; and with all the becoming of creation of which God as Creator and Redeemer and Sanctifier is cognizant and in completest touch. But Becoming,¹ if secondary, is yet of the essence of things. And so, we may thankfully and lovingly and adoringly believe, is Pain.

¹ Those who think Time and therefore Becoming to be in quite the first rank of reality would, I suppose, give pain a still higher place than is here claimed for it.

IX

PRACTICAL RESULTS

IF pain really occupies the place in life which we have given it, the Christian attitude towards it and the Christian use of it are fully justified. Yet, being more or less paradoxical, they may seem to need some explanation. To quote a well-known passage in *Ecce Homo*: "The paradoxical position that pleasure is necessary for us, and yet that it is not to be sought; that the world is to be renounced, and yet that it is noble and glorious—might, if it had been taken up by a philosopher, have been regarded as a subtlety which it would be impossible to act upon. But as the law laid down by a King and Master of mankind, every word of whom was treasured up and acted out with devotion, it has had a surprising influence upon human affairs. In the times of the Roman emperors there appeared a sect which distinguished itself by the assiduous attention which it bestowed upon the bodily wants of mankind. This sect set the first example of a homely practical philanthropy, occupying itself with the relief of ordinary human sufferings, dispensing food and clothing to the destitute and starving. At the same period there appeared a sect which was

remarkable for the contempt in which it held human suffering. Roman magistrates were perplexed to find, when it became necessary to coerce this sect by penal inflictions, that bodily pains, tortures, and death itself were not regarded as evils by its members. These two sects seemed to run into contrary extremes. The one seemed to carry their regard for the body to the borders of effeminacy; the other pushed Stoical apathy almost to madness. Yet these two sects were one and the same—the Christian Church. And though within that body every conceivable corruption has at some time or other sprung up, this tradition has never been long lost, and in every age the Christian temper has shivered at the touch of Stoic apathy and shuddered at that of Epicurean indolence." Nor has it ever been *entirely* lost: although in the Middle Ages pain was almost idolized, just as pleasure is now.

The solution of the paradox seems to lie in the truth that, at any rate in this present life, pleasure and pain are not in themselves ends, but means to an end. "What is the chief end of man? Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever."¹ Thus they fall into their own natural place; not to be sought or avoided for their own sake, but just as each may conduce to man's highest and eternal good. Pleasure may be compared to the food of daily life and pain to its medicine or to its exercise. So there can be no general quantitative law or fixed rule laid down for their use, but it must

¹ The Shorter Catechism.

vary from individual to individual and from time to time. A true Christian is a lover of God; and a true lover is not deterred by any pain nor allured by any pleasure, but takes both as they come, indifferently: not apathetically, but rejoicing in either, if through it he can show his love. So a Christian is—

“ Thankful for all God takes away,
Humbled by all He gives.”

For himself, when he has to choose, he will sometimes seek pleasure and sometimes pain, just as now one and now the other seem to be the fulfilment of love. For others likewise. Only that for himself he will be on the side of choosing less pleasure and more pain, because he will be afraid of his own softness: and for others for whose good he is responsible, not knowing their heart, he will choose pleasure rather than pain.

Yet for others too, in this matter, as he would that men should do to him, even so will he do to them. “ Let the boy win his spurs ” is every true father’s feeling. To keep our dearest in cotton wool, especially in their youth, is no true affection, not in Christians nor yet in Pagans. What we should aim at for them as for ourselves, broadly speaking, is health of body and soul and therefore healthy conditions for life and growth; and these must include some hardness. According to the old proverb, *πάθήματα μαθήματα*: the things we go through are the things we learn through: and it is a pity to waste time—as we so often do—on thinking how to get out of

troubles when we ought rather to be thinking how to get the good out of them. There is pain of body and soul which cripples and crushes, and we should not seek this.

No Christian need attempt to maintain that pain always does good. So far as ordinary experience goes, there are cases in which pain seems to do nothing but harm, weakening moral fibre, hardening the heart, making people selfish or desperate, or undermining their religious faith. And there are other tragedies where innocent, gentle, loving people are crushed and killed by it. A strong faith may cling to the hope that in the end—

“not a worm is cloven in vain ;
That not a moth with vain desire
Is shrivel'd in a fruitless fire, !
Or but subserves another's gain.

“Behold, we know not anything ;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring.”

And indeed Christians, trusting as they do, that—

“God is Love indeed,
And Love Creation's final law,”

must believe that there is some complete justification of all pain ; but it is only on the ground of their creed that they do believe it. It is, to quote Tennyson again, a “believing where we cannot prove,” faith against sight. Such a faith is indeed a reasonable faith ; because we reason to it from what we know of God : but it is still

H

belief, not demonstration. That is to say, when, with the eye of reason we have seen it to be reasonable, we yet have to put out the hand of faith to grip it and hold it fast, so many are the apparent contradictions and difficulties in the way.

It is when some crushing, crippling pain comes upon us that our Christian faith draws out clear ahead of any other form of belief; for we can face the pain with the Cross: not with the healthy vigour of the natural man who will break but not bend; but in the supernatural power of the indwelling Christ crucified and alive for evermore. The pain may kill or cripple us; but God's strength can be made perfect in our weakness, and death is but the gate of life immortal; so that we fear no evil, for we belong to the Omnipotent God, and we are precious in His sight as members of Christ His Son.

Nor need we pretend that such pain is not in itself evil: what we have to do is to turn it to good by facing it for Christ's sake.

Pain is indeed in itself always an evil. Bentham says of pleasure that "the vilest pleasure which the worst malefactor ever reaped from the most abominable of his crimes is in itself a good."¹ The same conversely is true of pain. The most blessed pain ever suffered most gladly in the noblest cause or most subtly mingled with the highest joy is in itself an evil, just as black is in itself dark, however it may enhance the brilliance of diamonds set against it. And this is not only an academic truism: it is

¹ I quote from memory.

of practical importance to recognize that pain remains in itself what it was, even though its whole setting be so glorious as to dazzle our eyes.

It is with disabling pain as with any other disability or limitation which is not painful but only crippling. Generally speaking, if we can be free from it, St. Paul would no doubt advise us to choose the freedom. If not, we are not to care, because it is God's choice for us, even though made through unwise or wicked people; and therefore it must be a wise choice, for a good end.

This is the Catholic Faith; and if, without this faith, a man can be saved out of the evils of pain, how much more through believing it faithfully. And men are saved without it. There is a power in any faith, however unreasonable, however ill-founded, which for the moment lifts any ordinary man out of himself and above himself, and makes him able to do wonders. The child believes that his mother's kiss makes the bruise well; and it does make it well. The cottager believes that the bread pills will take away his pain; and they do take it away. The "Christian Scientist" believes that a broken arm does not hurt; and it does not hurt. And so with greater matters. In every variety of mental or spiritual healing, it is this same force of faith which is brought into play and conquers.

And there need not even be faith to save us from pain as distinct from bodily injury. We know that, very often, soldiers wounded in battle

and martyrs on the rack have felt no pain at all, simply because they had no attention to spare for it. And we all recognize the same truth on a much lower level with children who have hurt themselves, when we distract their attention from the hurt. We ought to carry out the same principle far more fully in our own lives, forgetting our pains in the interest of other matters for attention: instead of making our pains much worse, as we often do, by directing our attention to them and keeping it fixed there.

Indeed, we present-day ordinary Christians have a great deal to learn about the practical bearing of pain, especially physical pain: and we should do well humbly to learn it from the fine example of "Christian Scientists." It may be partly because a narrow and sectional faith is less difficult to maintain strong and effectual than a large and balanced faith. To be quite convinced that there is no such thing as physical pain, or that all such pain is contrary to God's will, as sin is, is a simpler belief and so perhaps easier to grasp and wield effectively than the Catholic belief.

On the other hand, we Christians know better than to think that our heavenly Father has but one blessing: we know that He deals with each of us according to our faith both in its strength and in its quality. So our faith does not suffer shipwreck if we have not been freed from pain as we had hoped and believed. We know that in the end we shall be more than conquerors.

If the foregoing is true for an individual as regards his own good, how much more true is it

when we consider ourselves as members of one another. Then when I am crippled, my pain draws out your compassion, my weakness reveals to you your strength, my incapacity your capacity. And when I see that, I can rejoice in my own infirmity which is your gain and so mine. If we were all pieces of perfection, we should have no need of each other, but should be like the round smooth corn of wheat in the granary, self-contained, self-sufficing, and at a standstill. As it is, our natural selfishness is fairly broken down by the appeal of the pain of our fellows, and we "fall into the ground and die": that is, we come out from ourselves and give ourselves away and live—live to each other and to God, in the courageous bearing of one another's burden, not without suffering.

But there is all the difference in the world between suffering imposed from without and resented and resisted and that same suffering taken up willingly in the strength of love. Then the pain is more than half joy. / And that is what we should covet, we disciples of Jesus. /

So there are saints whose heaven-taught method of prayer is to suffer, putting themselves to pain and laying themselves out before God in a readiness and strong desire to suffer for others at His Will, as He wills, for what end He wills. / This is not the least effectual kind of prayer.

ARABIC SCRIPT

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, p. 20.

HEBREW WORDS FOR *Pain*, chiefly from Brown's
Robinson's Gesenius.

1. אָנָן : trouble, sorrow, wickedness.
2. אָנָה : mourning, Isa. xxix. 2 ; Lam. ii. 5. R.V. mourning and lamentation.
3. בָּכָה : weeping, Ps. xxx. 6.
4. דְּאָגָה : anxiety, anxious care, heaviness, Prov. xii. 25 ; Jer. xlix. 23.
5. חָבַל : pain, pang.
Pains of travail. Distress of exiles, Isa. xxvi. 17 ; fig., of anguish of nations, Isa. xiii. 8 ; Jer. xiii. 21 ; xxii. 23 ; xlix. 24 ; of crises of redemption, Hos. xiii. 13 ; of birth of new Israel, Isa. lxvi. 7.
Of other than birth-pangs, only Job xxi. 17, pains, pangs, sorrows.
6. חָלַל (from חָלַל, to whirl, writhe, be in anguish) : writhing, contortions of fear, Exod. xv. 14. Anguish, Ps. xlviii. 7 ; Micah iv. 9 ; Jer. vi. 24.
Also, further removed from the root :
7. חָלָה : anguish, Job vi. 10. "Yea, ¹I would ²exult in *pain* ³that spareth not" (R.V.). 1. Or, *though I shrink back* ; 2. or, *harden myself* ; 3. or, *though he spare not*.
and 8. חָלָה : anguish, Isa. xxi. 3 ; Nah. ii. 11 ; Ezek. xxx. 4, 9.
9. סָרַח : burden, trouble, Deut. i. 12 ; Isa. i. 14.

10. גִּיּוֹן : grief, abiding sorrow (14 places).

11. צָאֵב : pain, Job ii. 13; xvi. 6; Ps. xxxix. 3; Isa. xvii. 11; lxv. 14; Jer. xv. 18.

12. צָעַס and צָעַט (צָעַס, to be vexed, angry): vexation caused by anger and ill treatment, undeserved, Ps. vi. 8; x. 14; xxxi. 10; Eccles. i. 18, "In much wisdom is much grief," R.V.; ii. 23; vii. 3; "Sorrow is better than laughter," R.V. xi. 10 (and 18 other places).

13. לִחְץ : oppression, distress, affliction (altogether evil).

14. קְדוּשָׁה : amazement, confusion, destruction (12 places), Ezek. vii. 7, the day of trouble.

15. מַכְאוֹב : pain, physical and mental. Of the troubles of the wicked, Ps. xxxii. 10; as the result of sin, Jer. li. 8; Ps. xxxviii. 18; lxix. 27. Of the Lord's Servant, Lam. i. 12, "See if there be any *sorrow* like unto my *sorrow*"; Isa. liii. 3, 4, "a man of *sorrows*"; "Surely He hath . . . carried our *sorrows*."

16. מִסְפָּד : wailing: for the dead, Zech. xii. 10, "as one mourneth for his only son"; calamity experienced; in contrition, Isa. xxii. 12; Jonah ii. 12.

17. מַעְצָרָה : sorrow caused by anger: "Ye shall lie down in sorrow," Isa. l. 11 only.

18. צָוָק : צָוָקָה, צָוָק, צָוָק : distress as constraint, straits as in a siege.

צָוָקָה : as above; and of distress from which the Lord delivers, Ps. xxv. 17; cvii. 6, 13, 19, 28.

19. בִּטְרָה and cognates: bitterness; usually with *soul* or *mind*, Gen. xxvi. 35; Prov. xiv. 10; Hos. xii. 15; Jer. vi. 26.

20. עָמַל : trouble, labour, toil; suffering, sorrow, Isa. liii. 11, "He shall see of the *travail* of His soul." Eccles. *passim*, labour, travail.

21. עָנִי : affliction of the poor, needy, humble, and meek: always in a good sense, of those who are afflicted, but God is on their side.

22. עָצַב and cognates: pain, toil, hurt (see מַעְצָרָה), Gen.

iii. 16; Ps. cxxvii. 2, "bread of toil"; Isa. xiv. 3, pain of exile: especially עָצִיבֹן, Gen. iii. 17; v. 29, toil of work in fruitful ground; iii. 16, of travail (all J.).

23. צָר: sometimes straits, distress, tribulation from enemies, 2 Sam. xxii. 7; Ps. iv. 2: so אָרָה perhaps always; and תָּצַר, Ps. cxvi. 3; cxviii. 5; Lam. i. 3.

24. רָגַז: trouble caused by anger: five places in Job (iii. 17, 26; xiv. 1; xxxvii. 2; xxxix. 24); Isa. xiv. 3; Hab. iii. 2.

25. רָעָה, רָעָה: evil, distress, misery, adversity, injury, wrong, moral wrong and evil. (The most common word.)

26. שָׁבַר: breaking, destruction, hurt, Jer. viii. 11; xxx. 15.

27. חֲלָאָה: weariness, exhaustion, Exod. xviii. 8; Numb. xx. 14; Neh. ix. 32; Lam. iii. 5.

N.B.—Several words which are rendered "sorrow," "trouble," etc., in A.V., ought properly to be and are in R.V. translated by words signifying, indeed, some cause of pain, but not pain or sorrow itself; e.g., בָּלָהָה and בָּלָהָה, Ps. lxxviii. 33; Isa. lxv. 23. Such words are not entered on this list, although perhaps they should be when, as in the above case, the corresponding verb may be rightly rendered "to be troubled."

NOTE B, p. 21.

In attempting to make out the development of any conception in the Old Testament, there is the difficulty met with, I suppose, in any early stories: that such conceptions have to be traced both according to the chronology of the history or story, and also according to the supposed dates of the various writings.

And, while we sometimes find a writer contrasting his own view with that of the heathen whose story he is telling,¹

¹ 1 Sam. iv. 3-9; 2 Kings xvii. 25-29.

this is hardly ever done where God's own people are concerned ; but either the crudest views are recorded and transcribed without comment,¹ or, much more generally, the writer throws back his own conceptions into the story he is telling. So that not in all cases can it be securely determined whose view it is that is given. And when it can, it remains to sort out the conceptions along these two lines.

In the Old Testament *story* there is, I think, but little record of what can be called development. An individual sins and is punished, and nations sin and are punished ; foolish acts are committed which bring their own evil consequences ; other innocent people are involved in the punishment or consequences : but there is very little of reflection on the causes or conditions of pain. It is taken for granted that pain follows any kind of misdoing ; and what is explicitly pointed out from time to time is not this general connection, but the particular kind of misdoing which brought about the particular consequence or punishment.

Further, the disciplinary value of Pain is seen continuously throughout the story. Punishment is seen to be not only retributive, exemplary, and deterrent, but corrective ; not only according to desert but to need, and especially according to the needs of the working out of God's purpose for His own people, and through them for the world. And it is here, perhaps, if anywhere, that there is some advance to be seen as the story unfolds : for at the beginning, God's judgements are perhaps seen to operate rather more in cutting off sinners so as to isolate His chosen, as in Cain's banishment, Noah's flood, Lot's call from Sodom, the plagues of Egypt ;² and later, rather more in the training of the Chosen People, in the Egyptian captivity and in the often repeated punishments in the

¹ Judg. xi. 24 ; xvii. ; xviii.

² And notice that the presence of ten righteous would have availed to save all Sodom.

wilderness : and, from the time when the Children of Israel are settled in Canaan to the close of the history of the Canonical Books, it is one long story of rewards and punishments, which were seen to be educative, not only by the prophets, but by people in general. The common people in Ezra and Nehemiah certainly seem to recognize the justice and purpose of their visitations more clearly than the common people in the wilderness. By this time every one is able to consider that "as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee."¹

But it would not for our present purpose be worth examining the story in detail.

Nor is it necessary to say anything about the teaching of the legal and sacrificial system concerning sin and pain. The only point which perhaps should be brought to remembrance is that the victim's pain was never considered to be part of the value of the sacrifice.

NOTE C, p. 22.

Σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας. 1 Tim. ii. 15. Not each woman, but woman, with the Blessed Virgin at the head, "*mutans Evæ nomen*." Woman's essential God-given function, mystically as well as literally, in the economy of the world is her part in the bringing into existence of humanity according to the ideal of the Son of Man; and the price of sorrow she willingly pays for it makes her a sharer in the work and fruit of salvation.² "The child-bearing" is Mary's *together with* women's in general.³

"Alles vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichniss
Das unzulängliche
Hier wird's Ereigniss

¹ Deut. viii. Cf. ch. xxviii. ; Josh. xxiii. ; 1 Kings viii.

² John xvi. 21.

³ Rev. xiii.

Das unbeschreibliche
Hier ist es gethan
Das Ewig-Weibliche
Zieht uns hinan."

Faust, pt. ii., end.

NOTE D, p. 42.

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say that the contents of each Psalm are not sorted out like the ingredients in a chemist's shop: that, (*e.g.*) Ps. xxxviii. might almost as well be a Good Friday as an Ash Wednesday Psalm. But I think we Westerns are inclined—as we say—to make allowances for what we think the inconsequence of Hebrew writers (saving, of course, their inspiration) when we really ought to try to correct and supplement our own ways of thought by theirs. Our thought tends rather to hop than march, so discrete and unrelated are its objects, even when they are human beings or nations. Hebrew thought, on the other hand, flows, and we dismiss it as "fluid": while we ought to be learning from this tendency something of the solidarity of mankind and of the immanence of God, unifying the world; for it is partly to its hold on these truths that its habit of rapid transition is due; though, no doubt, it partly comes from lack of the power of abstract logical reasoning. Just so with time. The Hebrew language, having no tenses to make distinction between past and future, passes readily from one dimension to the other. And, of course, the language springs from the genius of the thought, more concerned with the eternal than temporal. So long as the eternal verities of righteousness are secured, who and when and where matter comparatively little in respect of them.

NOTE E, p. 56.

THE ATONEMENT.¹

The Incarnation alone could not bring us back to God, because sin stood in the way. God is Life. To walk after the likeness of God is the way of life and joy, while to walk in sin is the way of pain and death : and mankind had gone the way of death.

Sin is described in the New Testament (1) as *παράβασις*, a trespass or transgression of the law of our being, which is God's law (Heb. ii. 2); (2) as *ἀνομία*, lawlessness or iniquity (Matt. xiii. 41; 1 John iii. 4); and therefore (3) as *ἁμαρτία* (much the most common word), missing the mark of our creation, which, as with any other race of creatures, means perishing; only, in our case, perishing spiritually, *i.e.* eternal death.

As breaking a physical law brings its own punishment, so does breaking a moral law. There is therefore nothing arbitrary about this. The way of death cannot be the way of life (Matt. vii. 16-20; Rom. viii. 6). God cannot "deny Himself" by treating sin and folly as if they were not sin and folly. God is Light and Love; sin is darkness and selfishness; and so God cannot but hate sin.

Yet God loved the sinners. So He gave His Only Begotten Son to become Man that He might save them from their sins. He did this by a life of perfect human obedience even unto death (Phil. ii. 6-9); and in Him and His obedience the Father was well pleased (Matt. iii. 17).

God has no pleasure in pain or death as such—not in that of a sinner, much less in His own Son's. But "to command nature [*i.e.* God's law] you must obey her;" and the Passion and Death of Christ was the supreme instance of this truth. There is no way out of a situation but by

¹ This note is based chiefly on notes of Lectures by Dr. A. J. Mason.

going through it; and He had taken upon Him, with human nature, the responsibility for its sin, and the suffering which that sin had brought on mankind. So He must overcome the root of evil, sin (which is selfishness), with good (which is loving, self-sacrificing obedience); and He must do away the fruit of evil, pain and death, by undergoing it.

He suffered all His life in body (Luke iv. 2; ix. 58; John iv. 6-8), and in soul, chiefly from contact with sin (Ps. cix. 1-5; Matt. xi. 19; xii. 24; xvii. 17; iv. 1-11; Heb. ii. 18). He did not keep aloof from us sinners (Luke vii. 36-40), but bore our sins lovingly, "in great humility."

But chiefly He suffered in His Passion. What killed Him because He could not bear it was the horribleness of our sins, which He had taken upon Himself as though they were His own. Being God, He hated sin just as the Father hated it. And just because He was sinless, being Man, He could be ashamed and sorry for our sins as we cannot. Sorrow for sin is the kind of pain which brings healing and life. And God looked down on His perfect contrition and confession and satisfaction and was well pleased. When He said "It is finished," He Himself was perfected as Man, and He had completely identified Himself with us (Heb. ii. 10, 11). He had loved His own unto the end, and had wholly given Himself for us in self-sacrificing love (John xiii. 1-4; xv. 9, 13; Rom. v. 6-12; Gal. i. 4; ii. 20). He had done and suffered all, satisfying God's law.

There are several words used in the New Testament to express one aspect and another of the Atonement.

1. *Mediation* (1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24).—He, the Mediator, came between God and man, as a bridge over a chasm, to unite them. In His own Person He united the infinite Divine Nature with the finite, created Human nature. He became not only *a man* but *Man*. All mankind has its being in Him. So that we are "accepted in the beloved" (Eph. i. 6).

2. *Propitiation*: ἱλασμός (1 John ii. 2; iv. 10; Heb. ii. 17).—Human nature in His Person had acknowledged the law of righteousness and its own guilt, by obedience unto death, and so had done away with the bar which mankind had raised to the exercise of the Father's loving kindness.

3. *Price*; *Purchase*: τιμή; ἀγοράζειν (1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 1); *Ransom*: λύτρον (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; Luke xxiv. 21; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18).—This is as we say of a commander, "He paid a heavy price, he bought the victory dearly." The "price" was not paid to any one: it was incidental to the gain; it was the cost which lay in the nature of things. If we remember that pain and death are in their nature loss and evil, then we shall understand that they cannot be literally given in exchange for good. And though it is true that He gave Himself for us (Gal. ii. 20)—He who is infinitely precious—it was not instead of us, but that He might win and give us too to God. He died not as our substitute but as our surety. In Christ, we too win for ourselves and for others joy through pain, life through death, sanctification through penitence.

4. *Redemption*: ἀπολύτρωσις (1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 7, 14; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15).

5. *Salvation*: σωτηρία (Heb. v. 9).—He redeemed and saved us from our sins (Matt. i. 21), and from eternal death. He did this, not by suffering eternal death instead of us; but by laying hold of mankind (Heb. ii. 16) just on the edge of the pit, and turning it round and bringing it back in His own Person through suffering to eternal life.

6. *Reconciliation*: καταλλαγή, καταλλάσσειν (Rom. v. 11; xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18 and ff.), and ἀποκαταλλάσσειν (Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20, 21). In all these passages, the word is used of reconciling, not God to man, but man to God. Christ taught men, by His life and death and by His words, what God is, what man is, and what sin is. God is love; man is the child of a most loving Father; sin is foolish rebellion

of man's will against God's holy, loving, and wise will, and an ungrateful outrage on His love. So He made man hate sin, and long to be united with God in love and obedience. And He showed the way by His own example. We, His members, are drawn to follow our Head.

7. *Sacrifice*: *θυσία, προσφορά* (Eph. v. 2; Heb. ix. 26; x. 12).—This can hardly be said to express any one aspect of the Atonement; for it includes all, and even more than all that is generally included in the word *atonement*; because it belongs more properly to Christ's work in heaven. The death of the victim was only the first great step in the sacrifice. The climax or most important action was the offering in the sanctuary of the victim and its "blood, which is the life." We look back to the Cross to learn what love is (1 John iii. 16; Rom. viii. 23): we look to heaven and to the sacraments to see what that Love is doing for us now.

NOTE F, p. 84.

"The main thought of Böhm's philosophizing is this: that self-distinction, inner diremption, is the essential character of spirit, and consequently of God, so far as God is to be conceived as spirit. To Böhm God is a living spirit only if, and so far as, he comprehends within himself difference from himself, and through this other, this difference within himself, is manifest, is an object, is a cognizing consciousness. The difference of God in God is alone the source of his and of all actusity and spontaneity, the spring and jet of self-actuating life, that out of its own self creates and produces consciousness. Böhm is exhaustless in metaphors to render intelligible this negativity in God, this self-differentiation and this self-externalization of God into a world. Vast width without end, he says, stands in need of a straitness and confiningness in which it may manifest itself; for in width without confinement manifestation were impossible: there must, therefore, be a drawing-in and a

closing-in through which a manifestation may be realized. See, he elsewhere exclaims, were will only of one sort, then mind had only one quality, and were a moveless thing, that lay ever still, and did nothing further than always one and the same thing ; there were no joy in it, neither any art nor science of severals, and there were no wisdom ; all were a nothing, and there were properly no mind nor will to anything, for all were only the sole and single. It cannot be said, then, that the entire God is in a single will and a single being ; there is a difference. Nothing without contrariety can become manifest to itself ; for were there nothing to resist it, it would proceed perpetually of itself outwards, and would not return again into itself ; but if it enter not again into itself, as into that out of which it originally went, nothing is known to it of its primal being. Böhm expresses the above thought quite perfectly, when, in his answer to theosophical questions, he says : the reader is to understand that in Yes and No consist all things, be they divine, diabolic, terrestrial, or however they may be named. The One, as the Yes, is pure power and love, and it is the truth of God, and God Himself. He were incognisable in Himself, and in Him there were no joy or upliftingness, nor yet feeling, without the No. The No is a counter-stroke of the Yes, or of the truth, in order that the truth may be manifest and a something, wherein there may be a *contrarium*, wherein there may be the eternal love, moving, feeling and willing. For a one has nothing in itself that it can will, unless it double itself that it may be two ; neither can it feel itself in oneness, but in twoness it feels itself. In short, without difference, without antithesis, without duality, there is, according to Böhm, no knowledge, no consciousness possible ; only in its other, in its opposite (that is yet identical with its own being), does something become clear and conscious to itself. It lay at hand to connect this fundamental idea, the thought of a one that in itself differentiated itself, with the doctrine of the Trinity ; and the

trinitarian schema accordingly, in many an application and illustration, underlies Böhm's conception of the divine life and differentiating process. Schelling afterwards took up anew these ideas of Böhm's, and philosophically reconstructed them."—Schwegler's *History of Philosophy*, transl. Stirling, p. 154.

"Man himself therefore is comprehended in the idea of God, and this comprehension may be thus expressed—that the unity of man with God is posited in the Christian religion. But this unity must not be superficially conceived, as if God were only man, and man, without further condition, were God. Man, on the contrary, is Divine only in so far as he annuls the merely Natural and Limited in his spirit and elevates himself to God. . . . In this Idea of God, then, is to be found also the *Reconciliation* that heals the pain and inward suffering of man. The Suffering itself is henceforth recognized as an instrument necessary for producing the unity of man with God. This implicit unity exists in the first place only for the thinking speculative consciousness; but . . . it must also exist for the sensuous, representative consciousness—it must also become an object for the World—it must *appear*, and that in the sensuous form appropriate to spirit, which is the human. *Christ has appeared*—a Man who is God—God who is Man; and thereby peace and reconciliation has accrued to the World. . . . The appearance of the Christian God involves further its being *unique* in its kind; it can occur only once."—Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, Bohn's ed., p. 336.

**Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California**

Return this book on or before date due.

